DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 462 SO 010 145

TITLE	Syllabi and Related Materials from Graduate Courses on the Teaching of Sociology, 1976.
INSTITUTION	American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.; Oberlin Coll., Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	95p.; Not available in hard copy from EDRS due to marginal legibility of original document
AVAILABLE FROM	Sociology Teaching Project, Carnegie Library, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074 ($3.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Course Descriptions; Curriculum Guides; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Psychology; Seminars; *Sociology; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teaching Assistants; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This publication contains course outlines and descriptions of seminars from graduate level courses on how to teach sociology to undergraduates. Some of the outlines are detailed, other outlines in the publication are brief. For example, the first syllabus is a detailed description by class session of a seminar-practicum on the teaching of sociology held at the University of North Carolina. It includes a listing of seminar goals, problems discussed, assignments, and a bibliography of student readings and supplementary materials. Another outline briefly describes California State University's Internship in Higher Education on Teaching Sociologists to Teach. This includes an overview of the course purpose and requirements and a listing of reading assignments. The names and addresses of the sociologists who teach the courses are included so that interested persons may contact them for additional information. A reprinted journal article describing a graduate course in the teaching of psychology, a brief report which relates to hiring practices for new junior faculty members, and a list of pros and cons on requiring of graduate students to take courses in teaching are also included. (RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ON TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOLOGY

projects of the american sociological association

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT GROUP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED142462

SYLLABI & RELATED MATERIALS

from

GRADUATE COURSES ON THE TEACHING OF SOCIOLOGY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Goldsmid

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

1976

4

SO 010 145

MAIL: ASA SOCIOLOGY TEACHING PROJECT - CARNEGIE LIBRARY -
OBERLIN COLLEGE - OBERLIN, OHIO 44074 - PHONE: (216) 775-8760

ASA SOCIOLOGY TEACHING PROJECT
CARNEGIE LIBRARY · OBERLIN COLLEGE
OBERLIN, OHIO 44074

Dear Colleague:

Attached are the set of "Syllabi and Related Materials from Graduate Courses on the Teaching of Sociology" which you recently ordered. A few explanatory notes are required.

A few of the syllabi included in this set are short and only briefly outline courses into which a good deal of thought has gone and for which rather extensive materials are used by the instructor. The sociologists who teach these (and all the) courses may be willing to share additional information and materials with you and it is for this reason that a contact list is included. We are indebted to the sociologists who prepared the enclosed course materials and allowed their distribution. If any substantial use of these materials is made, credit should be given to the author(s) involved.

~~Also included with the sociology materials you ordered are copies of two arti~~cles describing graduate courses in the teaching of psychology. These are sent at no charge. Included also are a letter and brief report (on the reverse side) by Harvard President Derek C. Bok which relates to hiring practices for new junior faculty members. We think you will find it interesting and related to courses in teaching.

We have included in the set of syllabi a list of pros and cons on requiring of graduate students a course in teaching. This list was generated during a session at one of the ASA Project's teaching workshops. While this comes without the discussion in which it was embeded, we hope you will find it of use.

Additional material on graduate courses in the teaching of sociology can be found in the special issue of Teaching Sociology, "Preparing Sociologists to Teach," 3, 3 (April, 1976). We are able to sell single copies of that issue for $3.50 through a special arrangement with the publisher, Sage Publications, Inc. The regular single copy price at Sage is $6.00, although if you order ten copies or more of a single issue their price is $3.00 per copy. We have enclosed a flyer which provides Sage Publications' address and subscription information.

You may also find useful, "Preparing Graduate Students to Teach," a 21 pp leaflet with 55 citations each with a 100-150 word annotation. The literature cited is not drawn directly from sociology but should prove useful.

We hope you will find the enclosed materials useful. The ASA Project would be very pleased to hear from sociologists teaching courses or holding workshops for graduate students on the teaching of sociology. Please do write to us and if possible, send copies of materials you use in such a course or workshop.

The ASA PROJECT is supported by Grants From
THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION (HEW), and the LILLY ENDOWMENT, INC.

Sociology 295B - Internship in Higher Education: Teaching Sociologists to Teach, California State University-Sacramento	Prof. Dean S. Dorn Department of Sociology California State University Sacramento, CA 95819 (916) 454-6522
Sociology 380 - Seminar-Practicum in the Teaching of Sociology, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	Prof. Everett K. Wilson Department of Sociology University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514 (919) 933-5502
Workshop for Beginning Teaching Assistants in Sociology (IV) + Program Certification in Teaching Sociology, Michigan State University	Prof. Bill Ewens Department of Sociology Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824 (517) 355-6639
Sociology 651 - College Teaching, Miami University	Prof. Theodore Wagenaar Dept. of Sociology-Anthropology Miami University Oxford, Ohio 45056 (513) 529-3432
Education 686 - Seminar on College Teaching, University of Massachusetts-Amherst	Dr. Sheryl Reichmann, Director Center for Instructional Resources and Improvement University of Massachusetts Amherst, Mass. 01002 (413) 545-0868
Sociology 510 - Teaching of Sociology, Case Western Reserve University	Prof. Saul Feldman Prof. Marie Haug Department of Sociology Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, OH 44106 (216) 368-2698 (Feldman) 2704 (Haug)
Sociology 0388:696-001 - The College Teaching of Sociology, University of Akron	Prof. T. Neal Garland Department of Sociology University of Akron Akron, Ohio 44325 (216) 375-7481
Sociology 8-955 - Seminar: Teaching Sociology, University of Minnesota	Prof. Robert Kennedy, Jr. Department of Sociology University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 (612) 373-2610

Sociology 380

Seminar-practicum on the Teaching of Sociology

1975-76

	PAGE
I - An Introductory Note on 380, its purpose and pattern	1
II - Evaluation of Students' Work in 380	5
III - Detailed Course Outline, by Class Session	6
IV - List of References and Supplementary Bibliography	13
V - Author index by major instructional issues	25
VI - Selected Journals pertinent to sociology & higher education	27

Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Everett K. Wilson

I - AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE ON 380, ITS PURPOSE AND PATTERN

Purpose

Our Department of Sociology instituted this course in 1968 to help first-time instructors improve their competence as teachers. To the extent that this is accomplished, we achieve three other aims affecting the department, the graduate student and the university.

(1) We add something to the meaning of an advanced degree conferred in our department.

(2) We strengthen the graduate student's bargaining position when he or she first seeks full-time employment.

(3) We come closer to insuring that undergraduates are competently and conscientiously taught (as required by university policy).*

Graduate students with prior teaching experience can benefit from 380; for much of its content will be new even to those with teaching experience. And of course any teacher may fall into routinized patterns of instruction which bear scrutiny. We note, finally, that people with teaching experience can and do make special contributions to 380.

For the course itself, a central aim is to raise questions that would not otherwise come to mind; and to seek answers from experience, from theory and, in a few cases, from the research literature. This entails tackling a range of issues many of which, despite their importance, go unrecognized by many sociology instructors.

There is no single road to effective teaching. To achieve a given instructional end there may be many means. Hence another, crucial aim of 380 is to help people seek out means of teaching with which they feel comfortable and about which they feel fairly confident. 380, then, is a first step along the way to creating one's own style of teaching sociology--an evolving, self-correcting style.

Pattern

This course has two parts, preparation and practice. We prepare for the teaching experience by creating necessary course materials, by reading, thinking and talking about common problems of instruction in sociology, and by considering various techniques, tools and styles of teachings. The practicum comes in the second semester, in the actual classroom experience with concurrent reflection on it and appraisal of it.

---

*"Graduate student teaching appointees should receive original letters of appointment and subsequent annual letters of appointment containing the terms of the contract. The letters should contain provisions for supervision and review of the performance of the appointees."

(From paragraph A, memorandum sent to Deans, Directors and Department Chairmen by J.C. Morrow, Provost, 10 March, 1969)

380: A Short Outline of Issues Treated in the Fall Semester

Preview: through a sketch of your course syllabus

1. Goals of your course
2. Teaching to reach such goals
3. Evaluating achievement of course goals

Product: your course syllabus--and other plans--ready for Spring semester

The following two columns give a condensed version of the two parts of the course, seminar and practicum, preparation and practice.

SEMINAR (1st semester)

Preview: blocking out your course syllabus: a first try at sketching content & sequence to be revised in the light of issues discussed through Fall semester--in effect, a crude anticipation of 1st semester's outcome.

1. Goals of instruction: identifying some goals specific to your course content (substantive goals) & some that transcend any particular content (non-substantive goals).

2. Teaching to achieve such goals:
   - 2.1 Views about undergraduate instruction in sociology
   - 2.2 Selecting materials to achieve course goals: texts, readings, & other resources
   - 2.3 Some recent innovations in undergraduate instruction in sociology
   - 2.4 Ideas on achieving common non-substantive goals such as (i) critical thinking, (ii) heightened awareness & enhanced skill in methods of analysis, (iii) ability to apply sociological knowledge to social issues & (iv) to extend propositions/generalizations to a wider range of social phenomena
   - 2.5 Teaching outside the classroom: remarks on papers, field work, office conferences, etc.
   - 2.6 Teaching formats & their outcomes: lecture, discussion, seminar, laboratory
   - 2.7 Common problems in achieving course goals (difficult points in the course--1st, last and middle classes--passivity of students, the view that sociology = common sense, avoidable gaffs
   - 2.8 Useful teaching resources: audio-visual aids, the computer, poll data, USGPs, etc.
   - 2.9 The TA's role & the social context of the TAs teaching

Continued. . .

PRACTICUM (2nd semester)

1. *Conducting your course*
2. *Videotaping, reviewing & assessing one or more of your class sessions*
3. *Classroom visit by one of the 380 instructors, with follow-up letter and discussion*
4. *Devising, administering a questionnaire for student appraisal of your course: its organization, its readings and other materials, teacher performance and the like. Summary & analysis of the data to be reviewed with one of the 380 instructors*
5. *Final paper for 380, reviewing and appraising your teaching experience indicating how and why you would do it differently next time around*
6. *Final evaluation of your work in 380 by the instructors, embodied in a to-whom-it-may-concern letter (Details are given on page 5.)*

Possible seminar sessions on

a. *The professorial role-set: counter-demanding roles & their management*
b. *The implications for teaching of different sociological orientations: operant conditioning, radical-critical, enthnomethodological and the like*

Continued. . .

3. Evaluating achievement of course goals
   - 3.1 Appraising extent of student achievement in your course: the social context of assessment & 3 purposes of testing: for certification (grading), for teaching, and for evaluating instructor effectiveness
   - 3.2 Evaluating extent of instructor achievement of course goals: student performance as teacher-grading & student appraisal of teacher performance

Product: reconstruction of your course syllabus ready, along with other materials, for spring semester's teaching

c. *Implications for teaching and research of differing academic settings: public universities, private liberal arts colleges, commuters' colleges, community colleges. . .*

d. *The undergraduate sociology curriculum: requirements and options for majors, offerings for non-majors (service courses): What should they be? taught by whom? and in what sequence?*

e. *Examining patterns of faculty collaboration in teaching (e.g., David Riesman's Soc. Sci. 136 at Harvard)*

and/or other matters of interest to the class

This pattern for the semester is not immutable. Time invested in various topics will vary with our interest and judgment of significance. When seminar members think it important to deal with problems not posed in this outline, we will do so. In short, the pattern sketched here provides an initial structure from which we can deviate when judgment so dictates.

Now a word on the pattern of individual seminar sessions. Our usual, but not invariable format is a discussion centered on a question (often with subsidiary questions). Typically there is reading to be done, beforehand. And sometimes we ask that you prepare short written statements on the question at issue, distributing these to everyone in the seminar a few days prior to the appropriate session. Often one or two members of the seminar will be asked to initiate discussion by demonstration teaching or by presenting a position paper, or a review of materials read, or a teaching device created to achieve a specific learning.

II - EVALUATION OF WORK IN 380

Among courses taken in our department, work in 380 differs in two ways. First, we fix not on the learning but the teaching of sociology.* Second, your work is directly pertinent to an imminent professional task. But 380 does not differ from other courses in the demands it makes for competent and conscientious performance.

This performance is evaluated chiefly by way of written comments from the instructors assessing students' oral and written work. This will be in the form of comments, rather than grades. (Students will not find it hard to translate such comments into the compressed form represented in the symbols L, P and H.)

All students in 380 are given an "Incomplete" at the end of the Fall semester. The course grade is assigned at the end of the Spring semester. It is based on (a) extent and quality of participation in seminar sessions, (b) adequacy of the written assignments, (c) effort invested in, and quality of planning for the course soon to be taught, and (d) the final course paper.

The to-whom-it-may-concern letter (under 'Practicum," item 6, page 3) does two things. It reviews the experiences that comprise 380 and gives the instructor's judgment of your performance and promise as a sociology instructor. This appraisal is based on the matters mentioned above, on observation of your teaching, on the written materials (handouts, examinations) prepared for your course, and on an analysis of your students' teacher-evaluations. We cannot make such a judgment with divine prescience. But we can do so with better evidence than is available at any other graduate department of sociology in the United States.

This letter is, first, a communication to the tyro teacher, i.e., to you. Then, if you so wish, a copy is put in your file where it may be used as part of a letter to prospective employers (along with your vita and other elements of letters of reference). This second use is determined in this way.

1. The letter is sent to you at the end of Spring semester.

* We are, of course, centrally concerned with your students' learning of sociology--what and how they can learn more effectively through your teaching. And it should be the case that your own learning is advanced as you teach--or prepare to teach--others.

2. In conference with the instructors you have 3 options:

   i. You may disagree with the statement and decline to have it become part of your permanent record. In this case, nothing goes to your file.
   ii. You may agree with the instructors' statement. If you then wish him to do so, he will transfer a copy of the letter to your file where it can be used by faculty writing letters of reference to prospective employers.
   iii. You may question one or more points contained in the instructors' letter and suggest revisions that you believe would increase its accuracy. If the instructors agree, the revisions are made and if the student so chooses, a copy of the letter goes to his file.

3. This letter is the only communication to anyone about the teaching ability of the TA.

Each of these options and procedures has been used by 380 students in the past.

III - DETAILED COURSE OUTLINE, BY CLASS SESSION

Date of class meeting is given in the left margin. The following figures in parentheses correspond to sequence numbers in the condensed outline on pages 2, 3 and 4. Sources for approaching problems listed in the lefthand column are indicated on the right as elements of the assignment. Assignments for each class session should be completed prior to that session.

Two dates should especially be borne in mind. Book orders are due in the bookstore by mid-October. And the full draft of your course syllabus (revised in the light of our discussions in 380) is due in the instructor's hands by November 22.

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	*Assignment and Sources*
AUGUST 28 What are the ends served by 380? How are these ends to be achieved? How and why do sociologists (like yourself) come to teach?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Read carefully and reflect on the 380 syllabus. (2) Skim and get an initial familiarity with McKeachie (1969). (3) Light reading of Astin and Lee (1966), and (4) Nostic, Clark and Rock (1968).*
SEPTEMBER 2 A case in point. From observing a class in action, what can one infer about course goals and the means used to achieve them?	*ASSIGNMENT: Visit a class session, observe what goes on, taking brief notes (thereafter elaborated in a statement of ends and means, and strong and weak points characterizing instruction during that session).*
SEPTEMBER 4 What practices do these observations reveal that might be plausibly related to effective teaching?	*ASSIGNMENT: Be prepared to present and discuss your class observations.*
SEPTEMBER 9 Preview How does one plan a course? build an adequate syllabus? How to take account of matters suggested in the course outline (left-hand column, page 3)?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) McKeachie(1969), chapters 1,2 and 3. (2) Review a dozen or so syllabi from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies in Sociology (CUSS) file, noting points of adequacy & inadequacy. (File is in the Department office.) (3) Block out a dummy version of your course syllabus. Include all categories of information you think will be helpful to your students, including a prefatory statement of purpose and importance. This draft is to be turned in at the end of this class session. (The complete, revised version is due 3 December.)*
I - GOALS OF INSTRUCTION	
SEPTEMBER 11 (1.1) What goals do I have for my course that transcend its specific content? (These are non-substantive goals, ones that do not reflect the specific sociological content of the course: e.g. ability to put r = .60 in words, or ability to formulate a testable hypothesis.)	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Cuzzort (1969: 314-23). (2) Review minimum essential learning for Sociology 51 to identify non-substantive goals. (3) Read Bloom (1956:201-07) and Krathwohl (1964:180-93). (4) Please prepare and circulate in advance to members of the class, a statement on non-substantive objectives for the course you will teach, along with a rationale for those objectives. State them in clear and concrete terms. Take one of those objectives and show (i) how you might teach to achieve it and (ii) how you would determine if it were in fact achieved.*

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	Assignment and Sources
SEPTEMBER 16 (1.2) What learning goals do I have for students in my course that are peculiar to its sociological content? (These are substantive goals.)	*ASSIGNMENT: Prepare & circulate in advance to class members a statement of substantive objectives for the course you will be teaching, along with (i) an illustration of the way in which you might teach to achieve this goal and (ii) how you would determine if it was in fact achieved. Be specific in your examples.*
II - TEACHING TO ACHIEVE SUCH GOALS	
SEPTEMBER 18 (2.1) What general position(s) do I take on the question: How is sociology best taught? What's my rationale for taking such positions?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Wilson et al. (1969b). (2) Reread "Minimum Essential Learnings for Sociology 51." (3) Please think through (and be prepared to defend your position) on the issues raised in Wilson et al. (1969b); and on the conception of minimum esstial learnings--as well as the specific set developed for Sociology 51.*
SEPTEMBER 23 (2.2) What text, if any, shall I select for my course? What other materials & resources? (And the important question: why? What criteria do I invoke in selecting these resources?)	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Read Rothman (1972). (2) Review 2 or 3 texts &, in a brief written statement assess their strengths and weaknesses. (3) Summarize in a series of words or phrases, the advantages and limitations of using a text in contrast to a clutch of selected readings. (4) In 5 or 6 sentences, state general criteria that would guide you in selecting a text or other materials/resources for teaching your course.*
SEPTEMBER 25 (2.3) How might various instructional goals be better achieved by means other than the conventional lecture-discussion format?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please read and evaluate examples of innovative teaching patterns reported in The American Sociologist and elsewhere.*
SEPTEMBER 30 (2.3) As above	*ASSIGNMENT: As above.*
OCTOBER 2 (2.3) What's meant by programmed learning? or self-paced instruction? or the Keller method? What are their advantages and disadvantages?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Johnston & Pennybacker (1971), (2) Fred S. Keller (1968), (3) Green (1971), (4) Syllabus for Physics 26-27, UNC-CH, (5) Syllabus for Psychology 26, UNC-CH, & (6) Eckerman (n.d.) Faculty resources: Professors Eckerman and Wiggins*

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	*Assignment and Sources*
OCTOBER 7 (2.4, i and ii) What are the theories and techniques of teaching critical thinking? What do I want my students to learn about methods of inquiry, & how can I get across, or reinforce certain methodological skills essential at this level of learning? (general & common non-substantive aim: How to help students sharpen their abilities to pose and pursue questions effectively?)	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Goldsmid & Wilson (1973d), (2) Goldsmid (1971), and (3) Take one element of methodology--e.g., classical research design, sampling, measures of central tendency, measures of association--and develop in fine & concrete detail a means of teaching your students how to use, calculate and interpret it.*
OCTOBER 9 (2.4, iii and iv) How bring sociology to bear on the problems of contemporary society in a helpful and intellectually responsible fashion? (the issue of relevance) How develop the skill to extend a proposition from one case or class of social phenomena to other cases/classes on the basis of analytical isomorphisms?	
OCTOBER 14 (2.5) What makes for adequate (& inadequate) instruction in extra-class dealings with students? through comments on papers, office conferences, field work and the like?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Wilson (1963), (2) Townsend(1973), (3) Wilson (1974) and (4) Harvard, Bureau of Study Counsel, Tape Transcript: GEN. ED. OH 1.*
OCTOBER 16 (2.6) What are the conditions, outcomes and techniques associated with different teaching patterns: lecture, discussion, seminar and the like?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Read (or listen to) pertinent Harvard tapes/transcripts, (2) for one of your class sessions indicate the 2 or 3 points you will wish to make in a lecture, noting the illustrations/data you will adduce in evidence, (3) for a class discussion, indicate the question(s) you will pose & the probable points that will emerge, to be summarized at the end.*
OCTOBER 21 (2.6, cont'd) Does it make a difference what pattern of teaching you adopt? What's the evidence?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read McKeachie (1969:100-69, 25-27, 253-4), (2) Dubin & Taveggia (1968), (3) Please prepare notes recording the main points you would make were you reviewing Dubin & Taveggia for the ASR.*

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	*Assignment and Sources*
OCTOBER 23 (2.7, i and ii) What problems are peculiar to the first class? (and the last and middle classes?) What are some possible solutions? What can one do about student apathy or passivity?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Goldsmid (1972), (2) Harvard (1968), (3) McKeachie (1969:11-17) and (4) Think through issues raised in various readings and prepare notes outlining your reaction to the transcript of a first class meeting at Harvard.*
OCTOBER 28 (2.7, iii and iv) In what ways does sociology contradict or go beyond common sense explanations of social life? What are some of the most common mistakes made by people who profess to teach sociology?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Please read Goldsmid & Wilson (1973), (2) Criticize, refute, revise, extend elements of the discussion on sociology & common sense, (3) read Goldsmid (n.d.) on avoidable gaffs in teaching, and (4) extend, with one example taken from your own experience or thinking, the list of common gaffs. Write down (i) the questionable practice, (ii) an explanation, if you can discover it, as to why it occurs, and (iii) preventive or remedial measures.*
OCTOBER 30 (2.8, i) What's the range of audiovisual resources & how may they be exploited in the service of my course goals?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Attend, reflect on the presentation by Professor Ralph Wileman of the AVA department, School of Education, (2) read McKeachie (1969:99-114), (3) select a table or other graphic material useful in the course you will teach and make a transparency. Try it out on the overhead projector.*
NOVEMBER 4 (2.8, ii) How can the computer be of help in achieving the goals I've set for my course?	*ASSIGNMENT: (1) Spend some time before class meeting working at IRSS at an interactive terminal. (Past experience suggests that most graduate students have had little exposure to the possibilities of using such terminals for instructional purposes.) (2) Please read various memoranda: Purdy (n.d.-2), Hoffman (n.d.) and others and look over a sample use of the IMPRESS system developed at Dartmouth by Davis (1971).*

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	*Assignment and Sources*
NOVEMBER 6 (2.9, i) What characteristics are peculiar to the TA's role: as assistant, conducting a section of a larger course? and as autonomous instructor?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please read (1) Dubin and Beisse (1967), (2) Koen (1968) and (3) Chase (1970).*
NOVEMBER 11 (2.9, ii) How does the organization of the university, and of my profession affect the teaching-learning process? How do various standards and regulations hinder and promote teaching and learning?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please read (1) UNC Faculty Council (1971), (2) UNC Office of Records & Registration (1971), (3) UNC Faculty Council (1969), (4) UNC "Procedures for Use in Case of Refusal by Graduate Student Service Appointees. . . and (5) Kingman Brewster (1972).*
NOVEMBER 13 (2.9, iii) What's the range of student populations? How do differences in student populations affect the teaching process?	
III - EVALUATING ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE GOALS	
NOVEMBER 18 (3.1, i) What are the purposes of testing? Are they compatible? What are the advantages and disadvantages of different modes of examination? How shall I grade? On a curve? Otherwise?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please read (1) McKeachie (1969:124-50,120-2), (2) Middleton (n.d.), Wilson (1969a) which includes The Psychological Corporation, "Some Principles for Preparing Multiple Choice Items," and (4) Memoranda on the use of grading norms, Lenski et al. (1970, et seq.)*
NOVEMBER 20 (3.1, ii) What specific examination items, of what sort can I employ in quizzes, midterm and final examinations to get some sense of degree of students' achievement of the course's goals?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please prepare at least 3 each of the following: (1) items to be used in a quiz, for teaching purposes, rather than for grading, (2) m-c items, (3) short answer--fill-in-the-blank--items, and (4) essay questions that will be useful for your midterm or final examination.*
NOVEMBER 25 (3.2, i) What's the point in assessing my effectiveness as a teacher of sociology? Can it be done? If so, how? And how should such evaluations be used?	*ASSIGNMENT: Please read (1) McKeachie (1969:212-27, 228-31), (2) McKeachie, et al. (1971), (3) Rodin and Rodin (1972), and (4) Gessner (1973).*

Date, Sequence number & Problems Posed	*Assignment and Sources*
NOVEMBER 28 (3.2, ii) What sort of instrument will I use to get my students' reactions to my course and my teaching?	*ASSIGNMENT: Review a set of instruments used at various colleges and universities for student assessment of teacher's performance. Make notes about what you want to include and emphasize in the questionnaire you will devise for your students to use next semester. Be able to justify matters included and excluded.*
DECEMBER 2 Product Penultimate version of syllabus to be submitted this date.	

IV - LIST OF REFERENCES AND SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abt, Clark C., Serious Games, New York: The Viking Press.
1970

Allen, Rodney F., et al., Inquiry in the Social Studies: Theory and Examples
1968 for Classroom Teachers, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Apostle, Chris N., "An Approach to Teaching Introductory Sociology," The American
1968 (Feb.) Sociologist, 3:31-33.

Astin, Alexander W., "Classroom Environment in Different Fields of Study," Journal
1965a of Educational Psychology, 56, 5: 275-282.

1965b "The Introductory College Course in Psychology: An Empirical Analysis," Psychology in the Schools, II, 4: 309-317.

1966 "Trends in the Characteristics of Entering College Students, 1961-65," Washington, D.C., American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 1, No. 4.

1968 The College Environment, Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education.

1966(Summer) and Calvin B. T. Lee, "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," The Educational Record, pp. 361-75.

Astin, Helen S., The Woman Doctorate: Origins, Career and Family, New York:
1969 Russell Sage Foundation.

Baskin, Samuel, "Innovations in College Teaching ." pp. 181-96 in Lee, q.v.
1967.

Bates, Alan P. and Sue Titus Reid, "The Sociology Major in Accredited Colleges
1971 (August) and Universities," The American Sociologist, 6:243-8.

Becker, Howard S., "Student Culture," in Roy Ingram, eds., The Dynamics of
1966 Change in the Modern University. Boston, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Boston University. pp. 59-80.

Bell, Daniel, "Reforming General Education," pp. 347-59 in Lee, q.v.
1967

Berg, Harry D., ed., Evaluation in the Social Studies (35th Yearbook of the
1965 N.C.S.S.) Washington, D.C., National Council for the Social Studies.

Bever, Barry K., Inquiry in the Social Studies Classroom: A Strategy for Teaching.
1971 Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification
1956 of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain, New York:
David McKay. (See also, Krathwohl, below)

1968 (May) "Learning for Mastery: Topical Papers and Reprints, No. 1,
National Laboratory for Higher Education, Instruction and C
Curriculum. (reprinted from Evaluation Comment, 1, 2.

Boocock, Sarane S. and E. O. Schild, Simulations Games in Learning, Beverly
1968 Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

1970 "An Innovative Course in Urban Sociology," The American
Sociologist, February: 38-42.

Boroff, David, Campus, USA, N.Y.: Harper and Bros.
1958

Bressler, Marvin, "Sociology and Collegiate General Education," in Paul F.
1967 Lazarsfeld, et al., eds., The Uses of Sociology, New York:
Basic Books.

Brewster, Kingman, Jr., "On Tenure," AAUP Bulletin, 58: 381-3.
1972 (winter)

Brim, Orville G., Jr. and Stanton Wheeler, Socialization After Childhood,
1966 New York: John Wiley. (In the first essay by Brim, see
especially the sections on "Socialization in Later Life,"
"Changes in Content of Socialization," and "Relationship to
the Socializing Agent."
In the second essay, Stanton Wheeler treats the distinctive
characteristics of organizations that process people -- charac-
teristics which, as they differ, make for different outcomes
in the process of later socialization.)

Brosnin, Michael, "College Teachers and Teaching: A Student's View," pp. 252-55
1967 in Lee, q.v.

Caplow, Theodore and Reece McGee, The Academic Marketplace, New York: Wiley
1961 Science Editions.

Carlson, Elliot, Learning Through Games, Washington,D.C.: Public Affairs Press.
1969

Chase, John L., Graduate Teaching Assistants in American Universities: A
1970 Review of Recent Trends and Recommendations, Office of Education, HEW, Washington, D.C. : Government Printing Office.

Crittenden, Butler, "A Lecture-Tutorial Approach to Mass Instruction in Sociology
1969 Attitudes and Performance," Purdue University, Department of Sociology, Purdue Experiement in Mass Instruction, Bulletin #2. (Also see McGee, Knuckman)

Cuzzort, Ray P., Humanity and Modern Sociological Thought, New York: Holt,
1969 Rinehart & Winston.

Davie, James S. and A. Paul Hare, "Buttondown Collar Culture: A Study of
1956 (winter) Undergraduate Life at a Men's College," Human Organization, 14: 13-20.

Davis, James, excerpt from "Samples of IMPRESS System Output."
1971

DeFleur, Melvin L., et al., "The Departmental Chairmanship: An Analysis of
1970(winter) a Changing Social Role," Pacific Sociological Review, 13, 1: 5-18. (symposium of five papers on the topic)

Dubin, Robert and Fredric Beisse, "The Assistant: Academic Subaltern," Adminis-
1967 trative Science Quarterly, 11: 521-47.

1969 and R. Alan Hedley, The Medium May Be Related to the Message: College Instruction by TV, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

1968 and Thomas C. Taveggia, The Teaching-Learning Paradox, Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

Dudley, Larin S. and A. P. Garbin, "The Prestige of Sociology as Compared to
1973 (August) Other College Majors," The American Sociologist, 7: 7-8.

Dunphy, Dexter C., "Planned Environments for Learning in the Social Sciences:
1967 (November) Two Innovative Courses at Harvard," The American Sociologist, 2: 202-6.

Ebie, Kenneth E., Professors as Teachers, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
1972

Eckerman, David, "Some Rambling Thoughts about the Keller Plan."
1971

Eddy, Edward D. Jr., The College Influence on Student Character, Washington, D.C.: 1959 American Council on Education.

Eisendrath, Craig R. and Thomas J. Cottle, Out of Discontent: Vision of the 1972 Contemporary University, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Fair, Jean and Fannie R. Shaftel, eds., Effective Thinking in the Social Studies 1967 (37th Yearbook of the N.C.S.S.), Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Farber, Jerry, The Student as Nigger, New York Pocket Book edition. 1970

Fenton, Edwin, The New Social Studies, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1967

Filene, Peter G., "Self-Grading: An Experiement in Learning," Journal of 1969 (June) Higher Education, XL, 6: 451-458.

Finger, Frank W., Professional Problems: Preparation for a Career in College 1970 Teaching, Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Freire, Paulo, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, New York: Herder and Herder. 1972

Friedland, William H., "Making Sociology Relevant: A Teaching-Research Program for Undergraduates," The American Sociologist, 4:104-10.

Gage, N. L., ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co. 1963

Gamson, William, SIMSOC: Simulated Society, New York: The Free Press. 1969

Gartner, Alan, et al., eds., After Deschooling, What?, New York: Harper and 1973 Row Perennial Library.

Gates, David P., "Sociology in Small U. S. Liberal Arts Colleges," The American 1969 (November) Sociologist, 4:324-30.

Gessner, Peter K., "Evaluation of Instruction," Science, 180:566-69. 1973 (11 May)

Glazer, Nathan, Remembering the Answers, New York: Basic Books. See especially 1970 ch. 1, "The Wasted Classroom," and ch. 11 "On Grading."

Goldsen, Rose K. et al., What College Students Think, Princeton, N.J.: Van
1960 Nostrand.

Goldsmid, Charles A., "Building Questions Into Lectures: Critical Thinking."
1971

1972 "Comments and Suggestions Regarding the First Day of Classes," pp. 1-11.

n.d. "Common and Avoidable Gaffs in Teaching."

1973a and Everett K. Wilson, "The Instructor as Benign Disrupter."

1973b "On Sociology and Common Sense," pp. 1-8.

1973c "Who Shall Teach What and How?" Position pager on issues touching undergraduate instruction in sociology presented at the Chicago working seesions of the Council of the Section on Undergraduate Teaching of Sociology, American Sociological Association.

Green, Ben A., "Physics Teaching by the Keller Plan at M.I.T.", American
1971 (July) Journal of Physics, 39:764-75.

Gulley, William H., "A Sociologist Looks at Sociology in State Colleges,"
1966 (August) The American Sociologist, 1:204-5.

Hall, Peter M. and Dalton A. Kehoe, "Student-Faculty Interaction and the Organ-
1971 ization of the University," Interchange, 2, 4.

Harvard University, Bureau of Study Counsel, Library of Teaching Styles (tapes/
1968 transcripts), "First Meeting, Problems of Communication."

On use of Office Hours & tutorials
Office Hours: review of 3 papers - Gen. Ed., OH 1
Tutorial: Orwell, 1984 - Eng. Tu 1 A-1
Examples of seminar operations
Weber & Freud: Soc. Sci. 7E-1
Incest Prohibitions: Soc. Rel. 8 C-1
Examples of course-section operations
Excerpts from Economics Sections -- LTS Ad Hoc 23 T-1
Identification of Organic Structures - Nat. Sci. 2 B-1

Hendershot, Garry E. and K. W. Eckhardt, "New Approaches to the Teaching of
1968 (February) Sociology: 'Doing Sociology" in an Introductory Course," The American Sociologist, 3:34-7.

Highet, Gilbert, The Art of Teaching, New York: Vintage Books. 1954

Hoffman, Carl, "Memorandum to Instructors Using (IRSS) Educational Services." n.d.

Hughes, Everett C., "Teaching as Fieldwork," The American Sociologist, 13-18. 1970

Illich, Ivan, Deschooling Society, New York: Harper and Row/Harrow Books edition. 1972

Jacob, Philip, Changing Values in College, New Haven: Hazen Foundation. 1957 (Concludes that the colleg experience is not effective in altering students' values. But see Newcomb, Personality and Social Change.)

Johnston, James M. and H. S. Pennypacker, "A Behavioral Approach to College 1971 (March) Teaching," American Psychologist, 26:219-44.

Kant, Immanuel, Education, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Paper- 1966 back edition.

Keller, Fred S., "Goodbye Teacher. . .," Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1968 (Spring) 1:79-89.

Kent, Laura, "Student Evaluation of Teaching," pp. 312-43 in Lee, q.v. 1967

Knop, Edward, "Suggestions to Aid the Student in Systematic Interpretations 1967 (May) and Analysis of Empirical Sociological Journal Presentations," The American Sociologist, 2:90-2.

Knuckman, Charlene S. and Reese McGee, "A Continuing Experiment in Mass Education -- 1969 A Progress Report," Purdue University, Department of Sociology, Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction, Bulletin #3. (Also see Crittenden)

Koen, Frank, "The Training of Graduate Student Teaching Assistants," Educational 1968 (Spring) Record , 49:92-102.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia, Taxonomy of 1964 Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook II: Affective Domain , New York: David McKay.

Kulik, James A., et al., "The Keller Plan in Science Teaching," Science, 183, 1974(1 February) 4123:379-383.

Kurtz, Richard A. and John R. Maiolo, "Surgery for Sociology: The Need for
1968 (February) Introductory Text Opening Chapterectomy," The American Sociologist, 3:39-41.

Lee, Calvin B. T., ed., Improving College Teaching, Washington, D.C.: American
1967 Council on Education.

Lenski, Gerhard, Charles A. Goldsmid, Richard L. Simpson and Robert E. Stauffer,
1970 et seq. "Memoranda on the Use of Grading Norms."

Levine, Donald N., "Sociology Confronts Student Protest," School Review,
1970 (August) 78:529-41.

Linsky, Arnold S. and Murray A. Strauss, "Student Evaluations of Teaching: A
1973 (October) Comparison of Sociology with Other Disciplines," Teaching Sociology, 1, 1, pp. 102-118.

MacKenzie, Norman, et al., Teaching and Learning: An Introduction to New Methods
1970 and Resources in Higher Education, Paris: United National Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization & the International Association of Universities.

Mager, Robert F., Preparing Instructional Objectives, Belmont, Calif.: Fearon
1962 Publishers.

Mann, Richard D., et al., The College Classroom: Conflict, Change and Learning,
1970 New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Marien, Michael, "Beyond Credentialism: The Future of Social Selection,"
1971(May/June) Social Policy, 2:14-21.

Morris, Peter, The Experience of Higher Education, London: Routledge & Kegan
1964 Paul.

Marwell, G., "Introducing Introductory Sociology: The Social Awareness Test,"
1966 (November) The American Sociologist, 1:253-4.

Mayhew, Lewis B., Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum, Atlanta:
1969 Southern Regional Education Board

McDermott, John, "The Laying on of Culture," The Nation.
1969(10 March)

McKee, Pierce and Butler Crittenden,"Freshman Sociology at Purdue: An Experiment
1968 in Mass Education," Purdue University, Department of Sociology, Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction, Bulletin #1 (Also see Crittenden, Knuckman)

McGee, Reece and Charlene S. Knuckman, "The Graduate Teaching Assistant: Effects
1970 on Students in Large Undergraduate Courses," Purdue University, Department of Sociology, Purdue Experiment in Mass Instruction, Bulletin #4. (Also see Crittenden)

McKeachie, Wilbert J., "Research in Teaching: the Gap Between Theory and
1967 Practice, 211-39 in Lee, q.v.

1969 Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher, Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 6th edition

1971(May) and Yi-Guang Lin, and William Mann, "Student Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness: Validity Studies," American Educational Research Journal, 8:435-45.

Meeth, L. Richard, Selected Issues in Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography,
1965 New York: Teachers College of Columbia University. (There is a section of this annotated bibliography, pp. 113-22, on improvement of instruction in higher education.)

Metcalf, Lawrence, ed., Values Education: Rationale, Strategies and Procedure
1971 (41st Yearbook of the N.C.S.S.), Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Middleton, Russell, "Handbooks for Teaching Assistants on Construction and
n.d. Grading of Exams."

Miller, Richard I., Evaluating FAculty Performance, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,
1972 Inc.

Mills, C. Wright, "On Intellectual Craftsmanship," Appendix, pp. 195-226 in
1961 The Sociological Imagination, New York: Grove Press.

1956 White Collar, New York: Oxford University Press, Galaxy paperback edition. (See section on "The Professors," pp. 129-30.

Monson, Charles H., ed., Education for What? Boston: Houghton-Mifflin (see
1970 especially, "On First Entering the Classroom,"), pp. 358-78.

Muir, Donal E., "The Scientific Training of Introductory Sociology Students,"
1968 The American Sociologist, 3:21-25.

Newcomb, Theodore M., Personality and Social Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart
1943 and Winston. (a study of the impact of Bennington College on students' political and economic views)

1966 and Everett K. Wilson, eds., College Peer Groups, Chicago: Aldine.

Newman, John Henry Cardinal, The Scope and Nature of University Education, 1958 New York: E. P. Dutton.

Nowlis, Vincent, Kenneth E. Clark and Miriam Rock, "The Graduate Student as 1968 Teacher," Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education Monograph, especially pages 1-24.

Page, Charles H., ed., Sociology and Contemporary Education, New York: Random 1964 house.

Panos, Robert J., "Some Characteristics of Junior College Students," Washington, D.C.: 1966 American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 1, No. 2.

1967a and Alexander W. Astin, "Attrition Among College Students," Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 2, No.4.

1967b and Alexander W. Astin," They Went to College: A Descriptive Summary of the Class of 1965," Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 5.

Pearl, Arthur, "What's Wrong with the New Informalism in Education?" Social 1971(Mar/April) Policy, 1:15-23.

Physics syllabus (26-27), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Psychology syllabus (26), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Purdy, Ross, "Memorandum to Teachers on Analysis of Machine-Graded Tests." n.d.-1 (to check on quality of test items)

n.d.-2 "Computer Assisted Instruction."

Raser, John R., Simulation and Society: An Exploration of Scientific Gaming, 1969 Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Raushenbush, Esther, The Student and his Studies, Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan 1964 University Press.

Reid, Sue Titus, and Alan P. Bates, "Undergraduate Sociology Programs in 1971(May) Accredited Colleges and Universities," The American Sociologist, 6:165-75.

Reimer, Everett, School is Dead: Alternatives in Education, Gardent City, N.Y.: 1972 Doubleday Anchor.

Richard, Michel P., "Kicking the Lecture Habit: A Non-Didactic Approach for n.d. Introductory Sociology." Paper read at ASA meetings.

Riesman, David, et al., Academic Values and Mass Education, Garden City, N.Y.:
1971 Doubleday Anchor.

1972 "Memoranda" circulated among the staff of Social Science 136, "Character and Social Structure in America," Harvard University.

Rodin, Miriam and Burton Rodin, "Student Evaluations of Teachers: Students Rate
1972(29 Sept) Most Highly Instructors from Whom They Learn Least, Science, 177:1164-66.

Ross, H. L., "The Teaching of Sociology in Metropolitan Colleges," The American
1966(May) Sociologist, 1:143-4.

Rothman, Robert A., "Textbooks and the Certification of Knowledge," The American
1971(May) Sociologist, 6:125-27.

Rothwell, C. E. and Associates, The Importance of Teaching: A Memorandum to the New College Teacher, Washington, D.C.: The Hazen Foundation.

Sanders, Norris, Classroom Questions: What Kinds? New York: Harper & Row.
1966.

Sanford, Nevitt, The American College, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
1962

Schur, Edwin M., "Recent Social Problems Texts: An Essay-Review," Social
1962-3 Problems, 10:387 et seq. (Rejoinders in Vol. 11, 1963-4.

Scott, W. A., Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities,
1965 Chicago: Rand McNally.

Sewell, William H., "Students and the University," The American Sociologist,
1971(May) 6:111-17.

Sibley, Elbridge, The Recruitment, Selection and Training of Social Scientists,
1948 New York: SSRC Bull. 58.

1963 The Education of Sociologists in the United States, New York: Russell Sage Foundation (See "Symposium on the Implications of the Sibley Report for Undergraduate Curriculum" -- Bates, Borgotta, Schuessler, Selvin, Coleman and Sibley -- in The American Sociologist, May, 1967), 2:76-83.

Sim, Francis M., and Gordon F. DeJong, Glen D. Kreider and David E. Kauffman,
1971(May) "Data Analysis for Sociology Undergraduates: Innovations of Instant Computation," The American Sociologist, 6:153-7.

Skinner, B. F., The Technology of Teaching, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1968

Skipper, J. K., Jr., and F. J. Kohout, "Family Names and Social Class: A 1968(February) Teaching Technique," The American Sociologist, 3:37-8.

Smith, Don D., "Teaching Introductory Sociology by Film," Teaching Sociology, 1973(October) 1, 1, pp. 38-61.

Snyder, Benson R., The Hidden Curriculum, New York: Knopf. 1971

Sokol, Robert, "Research Exercises for Introductory Sociology: The Data Card 1968(February) Technique," The American Sociologist, 3:26-31.

Stallings, William M. and Sushila Singhal, "Some Observations on the Relationships 1970(May) between Research Productivity and Student Evaluations of Courses and Teaching," The American Sociologist, 5:141-3.

Stoll, Clarice S., "The Non-Course: Innovation in the Undergraduate Curriculum," 1970(August) The American Sociologist, opp. 255-61.

1973(October) "Videotape as an Aid in Sociology Instruction," Teaching Sociology, 1:38-47.

Solomon, Daniel, et al., Teaching Styles and Learning, Chicago: Center for 1963 the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Sussman, Leila, Freshman Morale at M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press. 1960

Townsend, R.C., "The Possibilities of Field Work," College English, 34, 4:481-99. 1973(January)

Travers, Robert M.W., ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: 1973 Rand McNally & Company

Trent, James W. and Leland L. Medsker, Beyond High School, San Francisco: 1968 Jossey-Bass, Inc.

UNC-Chapel Hill Faculty Council, "Faculty Rights and Responsibilities." 1971(Sept. 10)

UNC-Chapel Hill Faculty Council, "Faculty Legislation on University Government," 1969 with special attention to Appendix C., "Status of Graduate Students Involved in the Instructional Program."

UNC-Chapel Hill, Office of Records and Registration, "Administrative Procedures," 1971(1 Jan.) (with special attention to section IX on policy and administration of the grading system)

Vargas, Julie S., Writing Worthwile Behavioral Objectives, New York: Harper
1972 and Row

Vebelen, Thorstein, The Higher Learning in America, New York: Sagamore Press, Inc.
1957

Vreeland, Rebecca S. and Charles E. Bidwell, "Organizational Effects of Student
1965(Spring) Attitudes: A Study of the Harvard Houses," Sociology of Education, 38:233-50.

1966(Summer) "Classifying University Departments: An Approach to the Analysis of Their Effects Upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes," Sociology of Education, 39:237-54.

Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest,
1966 Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences, Chicago: Rand McNally. (Clues to non-substantive goals and means of reaching them)

Wedge, Bryant M., ed., Psychosocial Problems of College Men, New Haven, Conn.:
1958 Yale University Press.

Whyte, William Foote, "The Role of the U.S. Professor in Developing Countries,"
1969(February) The American Sociologist, 4:19-38.

Wilson, Everett K., "Effecting Change in the College Student: Who Teaches What?"
1963 Yellow Springs, Ohio: Office of Educational Research, Antioch College. See also Ch. 3, "The Entering Student: Attributes and Agents of Change" in Newcomb & Wilson (1966)

1969a "Assessment -- for Teaching and Certification," mimeographed paper.

1969b , Robin Williams, Jr. and Charles A. Goldsmid, "Remarks on The Teaching of Undergraduate Sociology."

1974 "Some Guidelines for Responding to Students' Work, Orally or in Writing."

Wiseman, Jacqueline P. and Marcia S. Aron, Field Projects for Sociology Students,
1970 Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Wolfe, Alan, "Reform without Reform: the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education,"
1971(May/June) Social Policy, 2:18-27.

Wolff, Robert Paul, The Ideal of the University, Boston: Beacon Press.
1969

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Barzun, Jacques, Teacher in America. Boston: Little, Brown
1944

Brown, George, Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education.

Brown, James W. and James W. Thornton, Jr. College Teaching: A Systematic
1971 Approach, 2nd ed'n. New York: McGraw-Hill.

1968 eds. New Media and College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association.

Goodman, Paul Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars.
1964 N.Y.: Knopf & R!ndom House--Vintage Books (v-325) esp. Part III, Colleges, pp. 105-154 and the second essay, pp. 161-339.

Heim, Peggy and Becky Bogard. "Compensation of Graduate Assistants,
1969 1968-69." AAUP Bulletin. 55:4 (December) 483-487.

Monson, Charles H., Jr., "Teaching Assistants: The Forgotten Faculty"
1969 Educational Record, 50:1, pp. 60-65.

V - AUTHOR INDEX, BY MAJOR INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES

Academic profession and its organization: Astin (1969), Brewster (1972), Caplow and McGee (1961), DeFleur (1970), Eble (1972), Mills (1956, 1965), Whyte (1969)

Audiovisual media in teaching: Dubin & Hedley (1969), Smith (1973)

Computer applications in teaching and learning: Davis (1971), Hoffman (n.d.), Purdy (n.d. 1), (n.d. 2) See also: simulation, gaming, and role playing

Evaluation of learning: grading: Bloom (1956, 1968), Filene (1969), Glazer (1970), Krathwolh et al. (1964), Lenski et al.(1970 et seq.), Mager (1962), Middleton (n.d.), Vargas (1972), Wilson (1969a) See also: Student learning in higher education

by students, of classroom teaching: Gessner (1973), Kent (1967), Linsky & Strauss (1973), McKeachie et al. (1971), Rodin & Rodin (1972), Stallings and Singhal (1970) See also: Student learning in higher education, and Teaching, evaluation of

General: major collections cross-cutting several issues: Eble (1972), Gage (1963), Lee (1967), McKeachie (1967), Mann (1970), Meeth (1965), Sanford (1962), Travers (1973) See also: next listing

Higher education, general analyses including curriculum level critiques/proposals: Bell (1967), Bressler (1967), Eisendrath & Cottle (1972), Freire (1972), Gartner et al. (1973), Illich (1972), Kant (1966), Marris (1964), Mayhew (1969), McDermott(1969), Newman (1958), Page (1964), Pearlman (1971), Reimer (1972), Riesman et al. (1971), Veblen (1957), Wolfe (1971), Wolff (1969)

Objectives, non-substantive: critical thinking, higher cognitive learnings: Allen (1968), Berg (1965), Beyer (1971), Bloom (1956), Cuzzort (1969), Fair & Shaftel (1967), Fenton (1967), Glazer (1970), Goldsmid (1971), Goldsmid & Wilson (1973a), Krathwohl, et al. (1964), Metcalf (1971), Sanders (1966), Skinner (1968), Webb & Campbell (1966)

Programmed learning; self-paced instruction (including "Keller Method"): Eckerman (1971), Green (1971), Johnson & Pennypacker (1971), Keller (1968), Kulik (1974), Physics syllabus (n.d.), Psychology syllabus (n.d.), Skinner (1968)

Simulation, gaming, and role playing: Abt (1970), Boocock (1968), Carlson (1969), Gamson (1969), Raser (1969). See also: Computer applications in teaching and learning.

Sociology: innovations in instruction: Boocock (1970), Dunphy (1967), Friedland (1969), Gamson (1969), Knop (1967), Ross (1966), Sim (1971), Smith (1973), Stoll (1970), Townsend (1973), Wiseman & Aron (1970) See also: Simulation, gaming, and role playing, Computer applications, Teaching techniques, Audiovisual media and Programmed learning.

Sociology, introductory course: Apostle (1968), Crittenden (1969), Hendershot (1968), Knuckman & McGee (1969), Kurtz & Maiolo (1968), Marwell (1966), McGee & Knuckman (1970), McGee & Crittenden (1968), Muir (1968), Richard (n.d.), Smith (1973), Sokol (1968)

Sociology major, & undergraduate curriculum: Bates & Reid (1971), Dudley (1973), Gates (1969), Suilley (1966), Reid & Bates (1971), Sibley (1948, 1963), Wilson et al. (1969b)

Sociology of teaching & learning: Astin (1965a, 1968), Brik (1966), Eddy (1959), Hall & Kehoe (1971), McKeachie (1971), Mayhew (1969), Solomon (1963), Trent & Medsker (1968), Wilson (1963)

Sociology: training for the discipline: Dudley (1973), Sibley (1948, 1963) See also Sociology major.

Student learning in higher education: Astin (1965b), Dubin & Taveggia (1968), Gage (1963), Mann (1970), McKeachie (1967), Travers (1973), Trent & Medsker (1968) See also: Evaluation by students, Teaching, evaluation of.

Student populations and culture: Astin (1966), Becker (1966), Bloom (1968), Davie & Hare (1956), Farber (1970), Goldsen (1960), Jacob (1957), Newcomb (1943), Newcomb & Wilson (1966), Panos (1966), Panos & Astin (1967a, 1967b), Wedge (1958)

Teaching, evaluation of: Astin & Lee (1966), Gessner (1973), Kulik (1974), Lee (1967), Miller (1972) See also: Evaluation by students, Student learning in higher education

Teachers: TA's & first-time: problems & preparation: Chase (1970), Dubin & Beisse (1967), Finger (1970), Koen (1967), McGee & Knuckman (1970), Nowlis (1968), Rothwell

Teaching techniques, styles & problems: Goldsmid (1971, 1972 & n.c.), Goldsmid & Wilson (1973a, 1973b, 1973c), Harvard University, Hughes (1970), Knop (1967), Mann (1970), Monson (1970), Riesman (1972), Rothman (1971), Sanders (1966), Skipper & Kohout (1968), Solomon (1963), Wilson (1974) See also: Simulation. . ., Computer applications, Audiovisual media, Programmed learning.

VI. SELECTED JOURNALS PERTINENT TO SOCIOLOGY INSTRUCTION & HIGHER EDUCATION

Teaching Sociology

Published semi-annually (October and April) with its first issue having appeared in October, 1973, TS carries "empirical research articles, reports and essays which emphasize teaching with direct application to the subject matter of sociology. The overall objective is to contribute to the recognition of the teaching function as an important part of the academic profession."

The first issue carries (a) 3 articles reporting on innovations in course organization; (b) 4 articles on new technologies and teaching--videotape, film, simulation games and computer applications; and (c) 2 articles focused on outcomes and their measurement--student evaluations of teaching, and post-degree careers of sociology terminal MA's. We cite several articles in the 380 bibliography.

One year subscription is $8.00 to Sage Publications, Inc., 275 South Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90212.

Manuscripts can be submitted to The Editors, TS, Department of Sociology, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., 02881. (Mss should be sent in duplicate and should follow the ASA format; further information on the inside front cover of TS.)

The American Sociologist

Published quarterly by the ASA (and along with ASR it goes to all ASA members), TAS regularly includes articles on classroom teaching as well as articles on the status of the profession and parts thereof, and short articles on basic theoretical and methodological issues of profession-wide import. We cite several TAS articles on teaching in the 380 bibliography.

Change (The Magazine of Higher Learning)

Published monthly since 1968 by a nonprofit corporation, each issue of Change carries articles of wide interest on the academic profession. A synopsis of the February, 1974 issue will illustrate its typical scope and content: articles on trends in graduate education, on the internal politics of the University of Texas and how this affected education and research therein; on a multi-media class project used to explore and teach and communicate about the 1930s depression [by a Chapel Hill history professor]; a series of brief reports including one of unionization in higher education; synopses of recent decisions, issues and books touching on federal government policy, student evaluation of teaching, community college trends, NIH science policy, new books by Arthur R. Jensen and Everett Ladd and Seymour Lipset.

The Chronicle of Higher Education

A newspaper published weekly (during the academic year and biweekly during summer months) with current news on higher education, book reviews, editorials and a Bulletin Board of "Positions Available" in higher education. Best and most timely news on funds available and legislation touching higher education.

Beyond the above--which may be of greatest interest and relevance to sociology teachers--there are several score of journals which regularly carry material on aspects of teaching in higher education. A sampling are listed below to give and idea of the range of such journals.

Journals Relating to Specific Disciplines (Other than Sociology)

Teaching Political Science, Journal of Economic Education, Journal of Chemical Education, Journal of Medical Education, College English, Journal of Engineering Education, Journal of Dental Education, Science Education, CUEBS (Journal of the Committee on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences).

Journals Focused on Innovation in Education

(in addition to Change), Eccentric, This Magazine is About Schools, Journal of Experimental Education.

Other Journals Relating to Education at the College & University Level

Journal of Higher Education, Journal of Educational Research, American Educational Research Journal, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Educational Sociology, Audio-Visual Communications Review, Improving College and University Teaching, Harvard Educational Review.

Final Report

Workshop for Beginning Teaching Assistants in Sociology IV

September 16-19, 1975

Department of Sociology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

The workshop for beginning teaching assistants has been conducted each fall since 1972. Its aim has been to assist beginning teaching assistants in developing basic teaching skills related to their teaching assignments in the department. This year's workshop was held on September 16-19, 1975. It was led by one faculty coordinator, Tom Conner, and three graduate student coordinators, Pat Ashton, Laura Manuel, and George Tryban. All four people shared in the planning and conducting of the workshop reflecting the philosophy that was established in past workshops -- that it was a joint graduate student-faculty effort reflecting the common responsibility of these two groups for instruction in the undergraduate program.

Overall Objectives of the Workshop

Listed below are the specific objectives that guided the planning and execution of the workshop. As in past workshops these were selected and formulated in response to what faculty expressed they expected of a teaching assistant and to some extent in response to what the coordinators felt was important.

1. Beginning teaching assistants will know the expectations attached to their position: they will become familiar with its formal and informal requirements, range of functions, and relation to faculty members.

2. Beginning teaching assistants will know how to prepare and conduct discussion sections: they will become familiar with the range of purposes of discussion sections in this department, teaching techniques applicable to the classroom, and the importance of interpersonal skills in handling the dynamics of the classroom situation.

3. Beginning teaching assistants will know how to aid faculty members in the evaluation of student performance: they will become familiar with the construction and grading of both structured and unstructured examination questions.

4. Beginning teaching assistants will know what teaching resources are available to them in both the University and the community.

5. Beginning teaching assistants will become more comfortable with their role as they familiarize themselves with its requirements and how to fulfill them.

6. Beginning teaching assistants will become more comfortable with their role as they get to know new and old teaching assistants and the faculty members who can provide cognitive and emotional support.

7. Beginning teaching assistants will know the basic ideas involved in Teacher Effectiveness Training: they will have become acquainted with problem ownership, active listening, and three methods of conflict resolution. In addition, they will be aware of where to seek more information and training in this area.

Workshop Events

Workshop events were planned largely with the above objectives in mind, although some things were done in order to facilitate other events in the workshop. Specific, more detailed objectives were written for each event, or "module."

The workshop began on Tuesday evening with a get acquainted session at Tom Conner's house. The objectives of this module were:

1. To acquaint the participants with each other so that they will feel more comfortable talking to each other and will be able to participate in workshop activities without undue tension or anxiety. This should be done so as to avoid embarrassing anyone and to avoid forcing anyone to disclose personal information when they prefer not to.

2. To make clear to the participants the history and purpose of the workshop.

3. To have all participants identify in writing their goals and objectives for the workshop.

4. To provide an opportunity for participants to ask questions about the structure and rationale of the workshop.

Beer and pop were served and even though most of the evening was structured it was in a relaxed atmosphere. After a brief talk about the history and nature of the workshop the participants played a "Who am I?" game with time afterward for conversation. Participants later formed into small groups to discuss their expectations for the workshop, which were presented to the entire group for discussion. The coordinators met at the end in order to make final plans and adjustments.

The workshop "proper" began on Wednesday morning. The modules on this day and succeeding days are briefly characterized below.

Wednesday

I. Formal Expectations the Department has for Teaching Assistants (9:00 - 9:30)

   A. Objective: To answer the question: What is it that teaching assistants are expected to do?

   B. Description: Presentation of the content of the Code of Teaching Responsibility, results of questionnaire (sent to faculty) concerning expectations for teaching assistants, and data on department of origin of students taking sociology courses. Discussion and reaction was encouraged.

II. Formulating Instructional Objectives (9:30 - 10:30)

   A. Objectives:

      1. Given one or more instructional objectives, to be able to select those stated in performance terms.

      2. Given a well written instructional objective, to be able to identify the portion of it that defines minimum acceptable performance.

3. Given one or more performance items, to be able to select those appropriate to the evaluation of the objectives.

B. Description: Material from Robert Mager's book Preparing Instructional Objectives was presented using slides in a way approximating programmed learning.

III. The First Class (10:45 - 11:30)

A. Objectives:

1. To review the special qualities of the first class session.
2. To provide teaching assistants with strategies for dealing with the crucial first day.
3. To ease anxiety about their performance on the first day.

B. Description: Informal presentation with discussion based in part on "The Dynamics of the First Class" by Lawrence Shulman.

IV. Teacher Effectiveness Training (1:00 - 3:00)

A. Objectives:

1. To provide Teaching assistants with the skills necessary to determine who owns a problem, and knowledge of why proper ownership is important.
2. To acquaint teaching assistants with active listening skills and their practical application.
3. To introduce teaching assistants to the three methods of conflict resolution and provide them with some practice of the No-lose method.
4. To create an awareness of TET in new teaching assistants and provide information about where they may acquire more information, more skills, and/or more practice of TET.

B. Description: Problem Ownership Exercise with Discussion; presentation of methods of solving conflicts; presentation of how to do active listening; and role planning exercise in use of problem solving techniques.

Thursday

I. How to construct exam questions (9:00 - 10:00)

A. Objectives:

1. To explore through discussion the functions of testing.
2. To illustrate the importance of matching learning objectives and expected test performances and to provide a step by step procedure for insuring that they do match.
3. To provide concrete procedures and examples of how to construct test items, both essay and multiple choice.

B. Description: Material based on Robert Mager's book Measuring Instructional Intent. Presentation using slides resembling programmed learning.

II. How to evaluate exams (10:00 - 10:30)

A. Objectives:

1. To inform teaching assistants of existence of scoring.
2. To provide teaching assistants with methods for insuring consistency in exam grading (internal and external).
3. To stimulate further teaching assistant thinking about constructive comments on student's work.
4. To initiate future teaching assistants into the realities of academic life: the consideration of ways of discovering and dealing with cheating.

B. Description: Informal presentation with discussion.

III. Preparing and delivering occasional lectures (10:45 - 11:30)

A. Objectives:

1. To list in writing the uses of lecture format.
2. To discuss and reinforce the importance of learning objectives.
3. To present and discuss techniques of preparing and delivering lectures.

B. Description: Group discussion on the purpose of lecturing. Informal presentation on how to lecture well.

IV. Conducting discussion groups (1:00 - 3:00)

A. Objectives:

1. To point out the differences between lecturing, reading, and discussion groups.
2. To discuss methods of identifying material relevant for your group.
3. To identify what the teaching assistant can expect to have happen in the discussion group, what the group can be used to do.
4. To show how to prepare for a discussion group.
5. To present some methods of presentation of materials.
6. To present some methods of discussing materials designated for discussion.
7. To present methods of tailoring the mode of presentation to the subject matter.
8. To present methods of stimulating and initiating discussion.
9. To present possible problems and ways to solve or cope with them.

B. Description: Discussion of what objectives can be furthered by discussion groups, informal presentation and further discussion,

assignment of discussion group planning exercise.

Friday

I. Continuation of discussion group module: (1:00 - 11:00) analysis in small groups of discussion group exercise assignment.

II. The teaching assistant's relationship with the Sociology Department. (11:00 - 11:30)

A. Objectives:

1. To inform teaching assistants about how they will be evaluated.

2. To acquaint teaching assistants with some of the political problems of being a teaching assistant.

B. Description: Presentation and informal discussion.

III. Evaluation of the workshop by participants.

Evaluation of the Workshop by Participants

Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop in two different ways. At any time during the workshop a participant could fill out a small slip of paper and drop it into a box which was provided for that purpose. A formal questionnaire was administered to all participants during the last session of the workshop on Friday. An analysis of the responses to these questions follows below.

The first two questions on the questionnaire ask the participant to list the two events in the workshop that were the most valuable to him or her and of least value to him or her. Nine people completed the evaluation form, hence an event could potentially be mentioned a maximum of nine times as most or as least valuable. Tables 1 and 2 below contain the number of times each event

was mentioned, given that it was mentioned at all.

Table 1
Number of times an event was mentioned as most valuable

event	number of mentions
Discussion group exercise and/or presentation	6
Instructional Objectives	5
Constructing exam questions	3
First class	2
Relations of T.A. to the department	1
TET	1

Table 2
Number of times an event was mentioned as least valuable

event	number of mentions
TET	6
Resources	2
Discussion group exercise and/or presentation	1
Constructing exam questions	1
Relations of T.A. to the department	1

It is clear from Table 2 that TET module was the least successful of all the modules.

Comments included:

"I felt playing the role of administrator had little value for me" (referring to the problem solving exercise).

"TET - don't remeber a damn thing."

"Didn't like the philosophy much. Seemed to be rather artificial."

"TET role playing [was least valuable]."

These comments highlight what I believe were the most prominent complaints - that the "Philosophy" (i.e. don't take on problems you don't own) was unpalatable to some, and new to others, that the teacher-student-administrator exercise was

insufficiently introduced, hence chaotic. I, however, believe (but have no evidence) that the real problem was a lack of time in which to present the ideas in a more measured way so that they could be better understood and digested.

The questionnaire contained 18 close ended-items. The content of these items and their form can be seen on the attached copy of the evaluation form. Table 3 below has the first 15 items ranked by mean score on the "actual" dimension. It also shows the corresponding mean score on the "preferable" dimension.

Table 3

Question no.	actual	preferable
2	4.11	4.75
4	4.00	4.50
10	3.78	3.33
1, 6, 11, 14	3.56	4.00, 3.63, 4.38, 4.25
3	3.33	4.88
15	3.22	3.11
9, 13	3.00	3.44, 3.00
12	2.78	3.67
5, 8	2.33	3.25, 3.89
7	2.11	3.33

Apparently we were least successful in helping participants feel competent in presenting lectures (Thursday 10:45, Pat), improve their ability to grade exams (Thursday, 10:00, Laura), and identify personal qualities and abilities useful in teaching (only an indirect goal of the workshop). We were most successful in helping them feel more competent at planning a discussion group (Thursday and Friday, all), know how to construct exam questions (Thursday, 9:00, Pat), and identify teaching areas they need to work on (indirect goal).

I made an attempt to assess where actuality fell short of preference. A scatter gram was contructed of the two groups of means, which is attached. It is

T.A. WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM: 1975

Directions: In recalling and evaluating your experiences in this Workshop, please indicate, by circling a number, the extent to which you feel each of the following situations (a) actually occurred and (b) you would have preferred it to have occurred.

KEY: 5-very much
4-quite a bit
3-a moderate amount
2-some
1-little or none

TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE WORKSHOP:	ACTUAL	PREFERABLE
1. make clear faculty & departmental expectations?	1. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2. help you feel more competent at planning a discussion group?	2. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
3. help you feel more competent at conducting a discussion group?	3. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
4. help you know how to construct exam questions?	4. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
5. improve your ability to grade exams?	5. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
6. familiarize you with univ. & community resources?	6. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
7. help you feel more competent at presenting lectures?	7. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
8. help you identify your own personal qualities and abilities that might be useful in teaching?	8. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
9. help you identify any personal problems or fears you have that might interfere with teaching?	9. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
10. help you identify teaching areas which you need to work on?	10. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
11. make you feel more comfortable with your T.A. job?	11. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
12. reduce your anxiety about your job?	12. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
13. increase your interest in teaching?	13. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
14. stimulate your imagination?	14. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
15. stimulate you to do outside reading in the future on educ.?	15. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

TO WHAT EXTENT:		
16. did you feel uncomfortable in the Workshop?	16. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
17. did you resent some parts of the Workshop?	17. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
18. was being with other new T.A.s valuable to you?	18. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

clear from the scatter gram that there is a positive correlation between actuality and preference (we did best on those things most desired). Three items stand out, however, as possibly less successful than desired. Item 7, helping to feel more competent at presenting lectures; Item 3, helping to feel more competent at conducting a discussion group; and Item 8, helping to identify personal qualities and abilities that might be useful in teaching were those three.

Finally, particpants were asked to make open ended comments about the coordinators. The comments were uniformly positive about all of the coordinators.

These two pp provide background on the origins of the TA Workshop at MSU.

Workshop for Beginning Teaching Assistants in Sociology

September 18-21, 1975

Beverly Purrington
Bill Ewens

Michigan State University

Few sociology departments have on-going programs for facilitating the development of teaching competence among graduate students. This is surprising, given the fact that the majority of sociology Ph.D.'s are employed as college or university teachers, and, while still in graduate school, many play a vital part in undergraduate programs as teaching assistants. Recently, however, several departments have made efforts to develop systematic sets of procedures for assisting graduate students in developing basic skills in college teaching, and a description and evaluation of one such program is reported in this paper.

History of the Workshop

During the 1971-72 academic year, the department's Quality of Instruction Committee met to discuss the feasibility of a program designed to assist beginning TA's in developing basic teaching skills related to their teaching assignments in the department. It was decided that an intensive workshop program prior to the start of each academic year was one way to accomplish this goal, and initial workshops of this type were conducted both in Fall 1972 and Fall 1973.

The Committee assigned the responsibility for conducting these workshops to a graduate Coordinator and three assistants, two of whom were graduate students and the third a faculty member in the department. The graduate students selected for these positions were all teaching assistants who had demonstrated competence in the classroom and were interested in teaching. Similarly, the faculty member was chosen to assist this program on the basis of interest in teaching methods and prior involvement in the undergraduate program. The workshop was conceived as a joint graduate student-faculty effort reflecting the common responsibility of these two groups for instruction in the undergraduate program. The staff for the Workshop was predominately graduate students since it was felt that they would be less intimidating to new students than faculty members and less far removed from the situation in which beginning students find themselves. It was also hoped that having capable senior-level graduate students involved in the design and execution of the program would facilitate the new TA's forming interpersonal ties with those advanced students in the department who were the most committed to college teaching.

The Fall, 1974 Workshop spanned a four day period, beginning with a Wednesday night session at a faculty member's home and concluding on Saturday morning with a Faculty Brunch where the beginning TA's and other faculty members in the department were given the opportunity to get acquainted with one another. Twelve beginning teaching assistants participated in the workshop program.*

*The Graduate students conducting the Fall, 1974 Workshop were Beverly Purrington (Coordinator), Pat Ashton, and Mark Sandler. The faculty participant was Bill Ewens.

Faculty Expectations

Rather than emphasizing the preparation of future college teachers, this workshop focused primarily upon the immediate teaching tasks that these beginning graduate assistants will be asked to perform. Although these goals are complementary in many instances, it was nevertheless felt to be imperative for the quality of the undergraduate instructional program that TA's be competent in the types of teaching practice in which they would most likely be engaged during their first few terms of teaching. Thus, in order to determine the departmental expectations regarding the duties of TA's, questionnaires were sent to faculty members during the Spring Term before each of the workshops to determine what faculty "expect a teaching assistant to be able to do."

In Spring Term, 1974, seventeen faculty members listed the types of duties and obligations that they usually require of teaching assistants assigned to their courses. Below are listed these duties and the frequency with which faculty members mentioned each of them.

Duties Performed by Teaching Assistants	Number of Faculty Listing Each Duty
prepare exam questions	15
grade papers and exams	15
lead discussion groups	14
serve as informal consultant to students--hold office hours	11
present occasional lectures	10
give feedback to instructor as to progress and adequacy of course	3
prepare grade distribution	1
teach some research methods	1
hand out materials	1

The descriptions by faculty members of their expectations regarding TA performance were also instructive in designing the Fall, 1974 Workshop. Listed below are a few of these comments.

> "Read and be able to evaluate and intelligently comment upon essay papers and essay exams. This means more than 'good job' or 'I disagree', by way of comments; I think it is important for students to get substantive feedback; a response to argument; a raising of questions; a sense of dialogue--in addition to an equitable grade. There is definitely a learned art to making good written responses."
>
> "Organize and lead discussion sections covering readings, lectures and the general content of sociology." "Know how to stimulate discussion." "Create a good discussion environment; drum up enthusiasm and knowledge necessary for catalyzing discussion."
>
> "Maintain office hours; consult with students." "Advise students and relate to their interests and needs with regard to the course material." "She/he should be able to interact meaningfully with students in order to master the subject matter of the course; she/he should be able to listen patiently and recognize what students are trying to say, when sometimes even they don't know. Thus, she/he should be intelligent, compassionate, sensitive to nonverbal communication; and should like and be interested in people." "A teaching assistant ideally should be able to work with a heterogeneous set of students. This means among other things the teaching assistant should try to concern him or herself with the learning experiences of individual students."

Goals and Objectives

Having assessed faculty expectations regarding the duties of TA's, one primary goal of the workshop was thus to assist these graduate assistants in obtaining the knowledge and skills needed to perform these duties. Also, looking at the situation from the point of view of the assistants themselves, further goals

for the workshop were that they be able to assess their own strengths and weaknesses with regard to teaching, experience reduced anxiety as they enter this new role, and begin to consider issues related to theories of teaching/learning as these relate to sociology.

A more formal statement of these general goals for the workshop, along with some of the more specific objectives related to these goals, are listed below. These goals and objectives, in turn, lay a basis for the workshop events and evaluation procedures to be described in the following sections.

GOAL I. BEGINNING TEACHING ASSISTANTS WILL HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS NEEDED TO PERFORM THOSE FUNCTIONS REQUIRED OF THEM BY THE FACULTY AND THE DEPARTMENT.

Objective I.1. Beginning teaching assistants will know the expectations attached to their position: they will become familiar with its formal and informal requirements, range of functions, and relation to faculty members.

Objective I.2. Beginning teaching assistants will know how to prepare for and conduct discussion sections: they will become familiar with the range of purposes of discussion sections in this department, teaching techniques applicable to the classroom, and the importance of interpersonal skills in handling the dynamics of the classroom situation.

Objective I.3. Beginning teaching assistants will know how to aid faculty members in the evaluation of student performance: they will become familiar with the construction and grading of both structured and unstructured examination questions.

Objective I.4. Beginning teaching assistants will know what teaching resources are available to them in both the university and the community.

GOAL II. BEGINNING TEACHING ASSISTANTS WILL ASSESS THEIR OWN STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES WITH REGARD TO TEACHING.

Objective II.1. Beginning teaching assistants will identify personal qualities and abilities which may be useful in teaching.

Objective II.2. Beginning teaching assistants will identify personal fears and problems which may interfere with effective teaching.

Objective II.3. Beginning teaching assistants will identify teaching areas which need personal work and/or departmental assistance.

GOAL III. NEW TEACHING ASSISTANTS WILL EXPERIENCE REDUCED ANXIETY AS THEY ENTER THEIR ROLE.

Objective III.1. Beginning teaching assistants will become more comfortable with their role as they familiarize themselves with its requirements and how to fulfill them.

Objective III.2. Beginning teaching assistants will become more comfortable with their role as they get to know new and old teaching assistants and faculty members who can provide cognitive and emotional support.

GOAL IV. BEGINNING TEACHING ASSISTANTS WILL BEGIN TO CONSIDER ISSUES RELATED TO THEORIES OF TEACHING/LEARNING, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SOCIOLOGY.

Objective IV.1. Beginning teaching assistants will become familiar with a variety of theories of teaching/learning.

Objective IV.2. Beginning teaching assistants will begin to work on identifying their own philosophies of teaching/learning.

Objective IV.3. Beginning teaching assistants will consider the question, "Why Teach Sociology"? They will become familiar with varying approaches and begin to identify their own goals in teaching sociology.

Workshop Events

Workshop events were planned with the preceeding goals and objectives in mind. At least one activity was schedulded to achieve each of the twelve objectives.

PURPOSE

To assist sociology graduate students to

(1) develop knowledge and skills related to college teaching

(2) obtain additional credentials for convincing potential employers of their dedication and competence as college teachers

REQUIREMENTS

To achieve this Certification in Teaching Sociology, a student must successfully complete the following requirements:

1. Workshops for Beginning Teaching Assistants. These consist of a three-day workshop prior to Fall Term and one-day follow-up workshop sessions at the beginning of the Winter and Spring Terms of that same academic year. Issues and problems dealt with in these workshops include how to prepare and conduct group discussions, constructing and grading examination questions, knowledge of university and community resources, and evaluation of personal strengths and weaknesses related to teaching.

2. Seminar in Teaching Sociology (SOC 870). This seminar is concerned with the theory and practice of teaching sociology. General theoretical issues relate to understanding the nature and development of the college teaching role in the United States and to understanding the history of educational criticism and proposed school reforms in this country. On the basis of existing theory and empirical research, it is also important to develop a general conception of the types of activities and social relationships that facilitate significant student learning in college and university settings.

With regard to practice, the seminar is concerned with the general problem of how to organize a course. The seminar will deal with topics such as the following: deriving and writing instructional objectives, organizing a syllabus, lecture organization, questioning and dialogue skills, examinations and grading, and evaluating instruction.

3. Sociology Teaching Practicum. To fulfill the requirements of the Practicum, you will teach a sociology course under the supervision of a Faculty Guidance Committee. You will select this three-person committee from faculty members who have volunteered to participate as Practicum supervisors. The functions of this Committee include working with you as you plan the course, develop a syllabus and course procedures, and deal with classroom problems. The Committee will talk with you from time-to-time about how the course is progressing, assist in evaluating the course, and read and make evaluative comments on a report that you are required to write analyzing your experience teaching this course.

4. Oral Examination. After you have completed all of the above requirements, the final part of the Certification Program is an oral examination conducted by the faculty members who have been involved in the various phases of your teacher development program (Faculty Workshop Coordinator, Seminar Teacher, Practicum Supervisors, and the Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies). The purpose of this meeting will be to review with you the report you wrote for the Practicum and to discuss with you more general issues related both to your teacher preparation in the department and to your future plans as a college teacher.

FURTHER INFORMATION

A description of this Certification program is included in the new 1976-77 Graduate Handbook. To find out more about the program you are invited to talk to the Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies or to members of the Quality of Instruction Committee,

PROGRAM FOR CERTIFICATION IN TEACHING SOCIOLOGY

department of sociology / michigan state university / east lansing, Mich. 48824

prof. bill ewens

Sociology 872, Section 3
Seminar In Teaching Sociology
Spring term, 1977

Time/Place: 7PM - 9:50
112 Berkey Hall

Bill Ewens
5-6639 or 351-8673
Office Hours: 1:30-4:00PM
Fridays

Department of Sociology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

REVISED SYLLABUS

This seminar is concerned with the theory and practice of teaching sociology. The focus thus will be both upon general theoretical issues related to the nature and purpose of sociology instruction and upon practical issues related to course organization, alternative instructional techniques, achievement testing, and the evaluation of teaching.

Readings

BAKER, PAUL. "Mass instruction in sociology: on the domestication of a pedagogical monster,"Teaching Sociology 4 (October 1976): 5-28.

BOWLES, SAMUEL and HERBERT GINTIS. Schooling in Capitalist America. Basic Books, 1976.

CAMPBELL, DAVID. "Behavioral objectives--the grande charade, "Today's Education. March-April, 1976, 43ff.

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON LEARNING AND TEACHING. "Grading by contract," Memo to the Faculty. University of Michigan, No. 57, April, 1976.

CONOVER, PATRICK. "The experimental teaching of basic social concepts: an improvisional approach, "Teaching Sociology 2 (October 1974): 27-42.

CROSSLAND, FRED. "Will the academy survive unionization?" Change Magazine, February, 1976, 38-42.

DAVIS, ETHELYN. Teaching Sociology: A Bibliography. American Sociological Association: Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology.

EBLE, KENNETH. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.

EWENS, BILL. "Developing programs for preparing sociology graduate students to teach, "Teaching Sociology 3 (April 1976): 305-326.

_____. "Tension points in the classroom: teacher-student communication problems," mimeo.

FRANCIS, ROY. "The 8 mm 'term paper': on helping sociology undergraduates to make films, "Teaching Sociology 2 (October 1974): 57-70.

FREIRE, PAULO. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Seabury Press, 1970.

FRANSECKY, ROGER and JOHN TROJANSKI. "Academic gaming, "Teaching-Learning Monograph Series. University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

GRONLUND, NORMAL. Constructing Achievement Tests. Prentice Hall, 1968.

HARACZ, KATE.. "The education of Kate Haracz, "Change Magazine, June, 1970, 12-26.

HILL, RICHARD. "Reflections on the practice of Marxist social science," mimeo.

KELLER, FRED. "Good-bye, teacher. . .," Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis 1, 1968: 79-89.

MAGER, ROBERT. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Fearon Publishers, 1967.

McKEACHIE, WILBERT. Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. D.C. Heath, 6th ed., 1969.

MEANS, HOWARD and PHILLIP SEMAS, ed.s, Faculty Collective bargaining. Washington, D.C.: Chronicle of Higher Education, 2nd ed., 1976.

NEWT DAVIDSON COLLECTIVE. "What next?," Crisis at CUNY. 1974.

POSNER, GEORGE and KENNETH STRIKE. "Ideology versus technology: the bias of behavioral objectives, "Educational Technology 15 (May 1975): 28-34.

ROGERS, CARL. "Regarding learning and its facilitation," Freedom to Learn Charles E. Merrill, 1969, 157-166.

SAWYER, JACK. "The case against grades," Daily Northwestern Magazine. No. 44, February 25, 1970.

TRENT, JAMES and ARTHUR COHEN. "Research on teaching in higher education," in Robert Travers, ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, 997-1071.

Topic Outline

WEEK	DATE	TOPICS	READINGS
1.	March 31	Getting Acquainted Negotiating Course Structure Organizing a Syllabus The ABC's of Course Organization	
2.	April 7	Course Organization Research on Teaching in Higher Education Deriving and Writing Course Objectives Critiques of the Behavioral Objectives Movement	Trent and Cohen McKeachie, Chapt. 2 Mager Posner and Strike Campbell

WEEK	DATE	TOPICS	READINGS
3.	April 14	Instructional Techniques, I Lecturing Personalized Instruction Alternative Mass Instructional Techniques (PRACTICE LECTURING EXERCISE)	McKeachie, Chapts. 5, 9, 16 Keller Baker
4.	April 21	Instructional Techniques, II Discussion Techniques Communicating with Students (VIDEO FEEDBACK EXERCISE)	McKeachie, Chapts, 6-8, 12, 17 Ewens, "Tension Points. . ." Kagen (Mel)
5.	April 28	Instructional Techniques, III Experiential Techniques Simulations and Games Role-Playing Audio-visual Techniques (EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING EXERCISE)	McKeachie, Chapts. 10-11 Fransecky and Trojanski Francis Conover
6.	May 5	Evaluation Achievement Testing Techniques for Assigning Grades The Pros and Cons of Grading Evaluation of Teaching Evaluation as a Management Technique	McKeachie, Chapts. 13-15, 22-2 Gronlund Cntr for Research on L&T Sawyer Haracz Eble
7.	May 12	Facilitating Significant Learning The Social Relations of the Classroom Co-mutual Instructional Techniques	Friere Rogers Ewens, "Developing . . ."
8.	May 19	The Contradictions in College Teaching (Why humanistically oriented teachers often get ulcers.) Education and the Structure of American Society	Bowles and Gintis Parts I & II Critiques of Bowles and Gintis
9.	May 26	History of American Education The Dynamics of Educational Change	Bowles and Gintis Part III
10.	June 2	Future Trends in Higher Education Education and Progressive Social Change Faculty Unionization and Non-reformist Reforms	Newt Davidson Collective Bowles and Gintis Part IV Hill Crossland

EVALUATION

Your grade in the seminar will be based upon the evaluation of two written papers, both of which will be due on Wednesday, June 8, of final exam week. There papers are:

1. A statement of your philosophy of teaching sociology. In this paper you should consider questions such as the following: What is the nature of significant learning related to sociology? How can this significant learning be facilitated? What contradictions and pressures are present in colleges and universities that might hinder your teaching? What types of coping techniques and social change strategies would be most effective in dealing with these contradictions and pressures? Etc.

2. A complete organizational outline for a sociology course which you plan to teach. This will include a complete syllabus, instructional objectives, class plans, exams, and course evaluation techniques. In addition, you should write a summary describing this course, showing how your instructional objectives, techniques, and evaluation instruments related to one another and to your overall philosophy of teaching sociology.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Seminar Outline

0388:696-001 The College Teaching of Sociology

Fall, 1976 - 2 credits

This seminar is required of all graduate teaching assistants in the Department of Sociology during the first quarter of their teaching assistantship. (Students beginning their assistantships in the winter or spring quarters should enroll in the seminar for the following fall.)

Goal of the seminar:

The purpose of this seminar is to provide a forum for the examination and discussion of various aspects of the college teaching profession, particularly as these aspects relate to the college teaching of sociology. By the end of the quarter the student should have begun to develop a basic philosophy of education and an approach to teaching which will guide the future development of his or her teaching career.

Basis for grading of seminar participants:

Your grade in the seminar will be based upon the evaluation of two written documents, both of which will be due on the last meeting of the quarter. These documents will be:

1. A statement of your philosophy of education. This statement must demonstrate an understanding of the various philosophies of education prevalent among college-level educators and a rationale defending the philosophy or philosophies to which you personally subscribe. References to empirical research supporting your position should be included.
2. A complete set of lecture notes illustrating how you present a selected sociological concept to your class and an explanation showing how the development of this lecture was guided by your personal philosophy of education.

Required texts:

Wilbert J. McKeachie, Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co., 1969). $3.95

Milton Hildebrand, Robert C. Wilson, and Evelyn R. Dienst, Evaluating University Teaching (Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971). 50¢

Kenneth E. Eble and the Conference on Career Development, Career Development of the Effective College Teacher (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, 1971). $1.00

Kenneth E. Eble, The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1974). $1.00

C. Easton Rothwell, The Importance of Teaching: A Memorandum to the New College Teacher (New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, n.d.). no charge.

Recommended optional text:
William H. Berquist and Steven R. Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development (Washington, D.C.: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975). $9.95

Topics and Assignments

Meeting No.	Topic	Assignment
1	The Mechanics of Teaching	McKeachie, ch. 1-4, 13-15 Rothwell, ch. 1, 2 AU Chronicle, "Statement on Professional Responsibilities."
2	Report on the ASA workshop in the Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Presentation by Dr. Charles Goldsmid, Oberlin College.	
3	Philosophies of Education. Presentation by Allan Wolf	Rothwell, ch. 5, 6
4	Techniques of Teaching. Presentation by Dr. Richard Gigliotti.	McKeachie, ch. 5-12 Rothwell, ch. 3
5	Panel Discussion: Approaches to Teaching Dr. Paul Sites, Dept. of Sociology, KSU Dr. Jerry Lewis, Dept. of Sociology, KSU Dr. David Reide, Dept. of History, Univ. of Akron	
6	Counselling	McKeachie, ch. 17
7.	Techniques of Career Development	Erble, entire book on career development.
8	Teacher Evaluations: Uses and Misuses. Presentation by Dr. James Gillham	McKeachie, ch. 22, 23 Rothwell, ch. 4 Hildebrand, Wilson, & Dienst, entire book.
9	Getting Ready	McKeachie, ch. 19, 21, 24, 25. Rothwell, ch. 5-7.
10	Evaluation of the Seminar.	

TO: Graduate Teaching Assistants 9/15/76

FROM: Supervisory Committee for Graduate Teaching Assistants

RE: Teaching Assistant Training Program

In the handout which you received earlier this year (dated 6/3/76) it was stated that a Supervisory Committee for Graduate Teaching Assistants had been formed. This committee will continue throughout the coming academic year. Members are Neal Garland (chair), Richard Gigliotti, David O'Brien, Kincaid Early, and Allan Wolf. The duties of the committee will be to develop and administer a training program for graduate teaching assistants which will attempt to aid teaching assistants in the acquiring and developing of teaching skills. The initiation of this program represents an increased awareness on the part of the department regarding the importance of teaching skills in the career development of the professional sociologist. This awareness reflects a similar awareness on the part of the American Sociology Association and grows in part out of the attendance of some members of the department (Neal Garland, Kincaid Early, and Allan Wolf) at a workshop on graduate teaching assistant programs sponsored by the ASA in Boston this summer.

This department's teaching assistantship program has been relatively unstructured in the past, with assistants being left to develop teaching skills largely on their own. In order to make your assistantship a true apprenticeship experience, it is desirable to create greater opportunities for feedback between assistants and Supervisory Committee members. The following structures are therefore being established:

As noted in the 6/3/76 handout,

1. Each assistant will prepare his or her own syllabus for distribution to his or her own section. This syllabus must include a statement regarding the assistant's goals for the course, reading assignments, topics covered, dates of exams, an explanation of any outside assignments, grading scale, office hours, and date of the final exam. Copies of this syllabus must be placed on file each quarter with the director of graduate teaching assistants and with the head of the department.

2. Each assistant will be responsible for the composition, typing, reproducing, assembling, administration, and grading of his or her own exams. Copies of examinations must be placed on file each quarter with the director of graduate teaching assistants and with the head of the department before they are given to the class.

3. Each teaching assistant will be required to administer a course evaluation to his or her class at the end of each quarter. The evaluation form may be either a standardized form chosen from among the many available, or it may be one of the assistant's own composition. After the assistant has analyzed the results of this evaluation, he or she will review these results with the Supervisory Committee for Graduate Teaching Assistants.

4. During the first quarter of the individual's assistantship, he or she will be required to enroll in 388:696, The College Teaching of Sociology. The purpose of this course will be to review various aspects of the teaching profession, particularly as they apply to the teaching of sociology at the college level.

In addition, the Supervisory Committee is making available several other opportunities for feedback between assistants and faculty. These options have been borrowed from teacher training programs utilized by other sociology departments, including the University of North Carolina, Michigan State University, and the University of Connecticut. Participation in these activities will be on a voluntary basis. The Supervisory Committee wishes you to know that these opportunities are available to you if you desire them.

5. Each assistant is encouraged to invite a member of the Supervisory Committee to attend and observe one or more of his or her class sessions. Following this observation, the observer will prepare a written evaluation of the assistant's performance and will indicate both strengths and weaknesses of the assistant's teaching skills. Several guidelines will apply to this observation activity:

   A. The teaching assistant will choose the class period to be observed.
   B. The observer must prepare a written evaluation together.
   C. The observer and the assistant must review this evaluation together.
   D. The assistant will determine what will be done with the written evaluation. Alternatives include:
      1. The written evaluation may be discarded.
      2. The assistant may retain the sole copy.
      3. The evaluation may be placed in the assistant's file for use as supporting material when applying for a job.
   E. The observer may not retain a copy of the written evaluation without the assistant's permission to do so.
   F. If the assistant feels that the observed class period did not go well, he or she may direct that particular observation be deleted and another observation scheduled for a different date.

6. Arrangements have been made with the University of Akron's Center for Educational Research and Development to have class sessions recorded on Videotape if any assistant so desires. Taping and reviewing of tapes will be conducted by Dr. Isobel Pfeiffer and her staff in the Department of Education. Dr. Pfeiffer and her colleagues will review your performance with you and will counsel you regarding your teaching skills. No member of the Sociology Department will see these tapes unless you request them to do so.

7. The Center for Educational Research and Development, under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Hittle, will conduct a series of one-day workshops on specific teaching skills during the year. Teaching assistants will receive notification of these workshops as they become available and are invited to enroll in any which are of special interest to them.

8. Assistants are invited to use the department's tape recording equipment to make an audio tape of a class session. Members of the Supervisory Committee will review the tape with assistant if invited to do so.

9. Teaching assistants should be aware of the fact that the department's well-equipped small groups laboratory facilities are available to them for use as a teaching device and as a means for assessing their own teaching skills. A lab assistant is available to operate the videotape and audiotape equipment. Arrangements for use of the lab can be made through Dr. Gigliotti.

10. Teaching assistants are encouraged to invite each other to act as observers of their teaching skills. Much can be gained through sharing of ideas, techniques, and materials. You are encouraged to make such sharing a regular aspect of your relationships with fellow teaching assistants.

To facilitate the sharing of information, you will find attached to this memo an INFORMATION SOURCE form for the reporting of journal articles, books, and other sources of information which you have found particularly useful in your class. If you will provide the information called for on this form and turn the form in to Neal Garland, it will be reproduced and distributed to all teaching assistants. In this manner, everyone can build a file of useful information from which lectures and class projects can be constructed. Additional copies of the form are available from Neal Garland if needed. Suggestions of other ways in which information can be shared will be welcomed.

The Supervisory Committee invites suggestions of other activities which you feel would be beneficial to you in developing your teaching skills.

INFORMATION SOURCE

Submitted by: _____

Source: ___ journal ___ book ___ magazine ___ other

Author: _____

Title: _____

_____

Source: (Give full journal title, number, date, page numbers, etc.; if book, give full publication data, etc.)

_____

_____

Concept(s) illustrated by this source: _____

_____

_____

Brief Summary of the article, book, etc.:

Prof. Dean S. Dorn
Dept. of Sociology
California State Univ.
Sacramento, Ca 95819

SOCIOLOGY 295B
Internship in Higher Education: Teaching Sociologists to Teach*

Purpose: Graduate students are prepared to teach introductory sociology in particular, but other courses, indirectly, in sociology as well. The emphasis of the course is a discussion of what is to be taught as well as pedagogical issues regarding how to teach. The seminar is divided into two parts - classroom discussion and field experience or internship experience (or, if you prefer, "practice teaching"). It emphasizes the need to deal with basic issues in the discipline, the use of the Socratic method as one model for instruction, and intellectual rigor. It is graded on a pass/fail basis.

Requirements: Each student who enrolls is required to become an assistant to a faculty member who is teaching a section of introductory sociology at a two- or four-year college. The student is expected to lecture, assign reading material, lead small group discussion, give examinations, grade, and generally do those tasks which the faculty member assigns to the student assistant. In addition, each student must attend once per week a seminar session in which the assigned reading will be discussed. The student must come prepared for discussion. In addition, the students will be required to discuss aspects of their field or internship experience with other members of the seminar. Finally, the student will be required to write a paper in which he or she designs, in detail, an introductory course in sociology and justifies it in terms of the issues raised in the seminar.

Reading Assignments:

A. Theoretical and Substantive Issues - a context for knowing how an introductory course fits into, it is related to, some of the larger issues and questions in the discipline of sociology.

1. "The Setting of Sociology in the 1950's," Lipset & Smelser
2. "Some Problems Confronting Sociology as a Profession," T. Parsons.
3. "Introduction to the Symposium on the Implications of the Sibley Report for Undergraduate Curriculum," W. Bates.
4. "Sociology and General Education," R. Bierstedt.
5. "Sociology and Humane Learning," R. Bierstedt.
6. "The Teaching and Learning of Sociology," N. Cantor.
7. "Social Methodology and the Teaching of Sociology," H. E. Jensen.
8. What is Sociology? (Chapter 1), A. Inkeles.
9. "Sociology as an Idea System," R. Nisbet.
10. "Sociology as a Teaching Enterprise," C. Page.
11. Modern Social Reforms (Chapter 1), A. Shostak.
12. "Explorations in Applied Social Science," A. Gouldner.
13. "Value-free Sociology," D. Gray.
14. Radical Sociology (the Introduction), D. Horowitz.

B. Pedagogical Techniques - a context for knowing how to teach introductory sociology after considering what should be taught.

1. "Instructional Development: An Overview," (Chapter 2 of A Handbook for Faculty Development).
2. Teaching Tips by W. J. McKeachie.

3. selected articles from the bibliography developed by Ethelyn Davis for the Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology and from the Resources section of Teaching Sociology, Vol. 3, April, 1976.
Students will select several articles from these sources dealing with innovations, ideas, and strategies for presenting Sociology to undergraduate students. Each seminar student will present to the seminar his or her analysis and thoughts regarding the selected articles.

C. Video taping - one way to examine individual styles of teaching.

If the students in the seminar agree, video taping of their performance/lectures in the classroom will occur. Discussions of the tape will occur in the seminar. This is not a requirement of the course. It will occur only if the student agrees and wishes to have himself or herself taped.

* For further details regarding this course, please see my article "Teaching Sociologists to Teach: A Focus on Content," Teaching Sociology, Vol. 3, No. 3, April 1976, pp. 265-276.

Department of Sociology
Case Western Reserve University

Spring, 1976

Sociology 510 - Revised Schedule

Instructors: Saul Feldman and Marie Haug

Credits: 2 semester hours

Class Times: The class will meet at informal brown-bag lunches every Monday from 12:30 to 1:45 in Haydn 103. First session will be on February 16.

Requirements for credit: Attendance at all sessions and one 10 page paper. The suggested topic is a comparison of two textbooks in introductory sociology or in a speciality. Another topic will require approval of the instructors.

Auditors: Auditors are welcome but attendance at all sessions is required.

Readings: Journal readings may be found in Freiberger (not on reserve). Books (Jencks & Riesman & Trow) are on reserve at Frieberger. Unpublished papers will be on reserve in the departmental library.

CLASS SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Date	Topic	Instructors
Feb. 16	Introduction	Haug & Feldman
Reading:	Roland Liebert & Alan E. Bayer, "Goals in Teaching Undergraduates," American Sociologist, 10:4, (Nov., '75), pp. 195-205.	
Feb. 23	How College age adults Learn	Krishna Kumar Education Dept.
Reading:	R. C. Atkinson & R. H. Shiffrin, "The Control of Short Term Memory," Scientific American, 1971, August, pp. 82-90. Gordon Bower, "Analysis of a Mnemonic Device," American Scientist, 1970, Sept.-Oct., pp. 496-510. Burton J. Underwood, "Forgetting," Scientific American, Mar. 1964.	
Mar. 1	The Introductory Sociology Course and Texts	Feldman
	CLASS BEGINS AT 11:15 in CLARK 209 (SOCIOLOGY 112A) to hear lecture in introductory sociology by Feldman and then will adjourn to Haydn at 12:30 for a discussion.	
Reading:	Reece McGee & Butler Crittenden, Freshman Sociology at Purdue: An Experiment in Mass Education. (unpublished paper) Butler Crittenden, A Lecture-Tutorial Approach to Mass Instruction in Sociology: Attitudes and Performance. (unpublished paper) Charlene S. Knuckman with Reece McGee, A Continuing Experiment in Mass Education - A Progress Report. (unpublished)	

Date	Topic	Instructor
Mar. 8	An Introduction to Learning Theory	Thomas Hyde
Reading:	B. F. Skinner, Technology of Teaching - Chapters 1, 2, 3 (This book is on reserve for Psychology 431).	Psychology Dept.
Mar. 15	Talented Teachers talk about Teaching	Charles Callander
Reading:	Christopher Jencks & David Riesman, "Reforming the Graduate Schools," pp. 510-544 in Jencks & Riesman, The Academic Revolution, (Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1968).	Anthropology Dept. Georgie Lash-Lurie Biology Dept.
Mar. 22	The Field Experience Exam Construction No Reading	Haug
Mar. 29	VACATION	
Apr. 5	The Student as Teacher CLASS BEGINS AT 11:15 IN CLARK 209 (SOCIOLOGY 112A) to hear a lecture in introductory sociology on sex roles given by Sandra Christie. We will then adjourn to Haydn Hall at 12:30 for a discussion.	
Reading:	Reece McGee & Charlene S. Knuckman, The Graduate Students in Large Undergraduate Courses (unpublished paper).	
Apr. 12	Meeting Our Clients: A Conversation with Undergraduates in Sociology	
Reading:	Joseph Zelen, "Undergraduates in Sociology," pp. 183-198 in Martin Trow (ed.) Teachers and Students (New York: McGraw Hill, 1975). Howard S. Becker, "What Do They Really Learn at College?" Transaction (May/June, 1964), pp. 14-17.	
Apr. 19	The Teaching of Sociology	Jetse Sprey
Apr. 26	Working Assumptions and Hypotheses about Determinants of Effective Teaching	Sharon Guten
May 3	Open Session - to be arranged by students in the seminar.	
May 10	Evaluating Teaching	William Holmes
Reading:	Robert R. Hind, Sanford Dornbusch & W. Richard Scott "A Theory of Evaluation Applied to a University Faculty," Sociology of Education, 47 (Winter, 1974), pp. 114-128. Robert T. Blackburn and Mary Jo Clark, "An Assessment of Faculty Performance: Some Correlates Between Administrator, Colleague, Student, and Self-Ratings," Sociology of Education, 48 (Spring, 1975), pp. 242-256.	

Prof. Robert Kennedy
Department of Sociology
1181 Social Science Bldg.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minn. 55455

Soc. 8-955
Seminar: Teaching Sociology
Winter Quarter, 1977

References: W.J. McKeachie, Teaching Tips, Heath, 6th ed., 1969, paper.
Teaching Sociology, Vol. 3:3 (April 1976) and other issues in Wilson library.
C. Wright Mills, The Sociological Imagination, Oxford, '59, paper.

Requirements:

1) Written preparation for a sociology course of your own choosing at either the freshman/soph. level, or the upper division level.
   a. The course syllabus, a maximum of 5 pages due FEB. 2nd.
   b. Justification for the content and organization of the course syllabus based on specified criteria, a maximum of 5 pages and due FEB. 2nd.
   c. Lesson plans for 6 lectures, maximum of 3 pages each, due March 9th.
   d. A 50 point mid-quarter exam which includes a mix of essay, short answer, and multiple choice questions and the key for grading the exam, due March 9th.

2) Participation in seminar sessions is expected and necessary for the success of the teaching practicum especially.
   a. Give a 30 minute lecture based on one of your 6 lesson plans.
   b. Act as a critic of the presentations of the other seminar participants by giving them both verbal feedback and written notes.
   c. (Given time) observe at least two lectures of one of the University's "distinguished teachers" with their permission, and prepare a 1 page summary of what you think "distinguishes" them from other teachers. Present your findings to the seminar on March 9th.

Class Schedule:			Readings:
Jan.	5	Teaching sociology: professional and ethical issues.	Mills: 3-194; McK: 179-181; TSoc: 229-288.
	12	Course Preparation (bring to class your criteria for what should be included in a syllabus--content & organization--and why. What should be in a lesson plan and why).	McK: 1-17, 91-114; TSoc: 339-378.
	19	Exams, grading, & evaluation (bring to class your criteria for what makes a good exam, your policy for grading, your use of course evaluations).	McK: 120-150, 206-239.
	26	Face-to-face. (Bring to class your criteria for what makes a "good" lecturer, discussion leader, tutor, and advisor.)	McK: 22-90, 115-118, 151-178, 182-205.
Feb.	2	Presentation: _____ : _____	
	9	Presentation: _____ : _____	
	16	Presentation: _____ : _____	
	23	Presentation: _____ : _____	
Mar.	2	Presentation: _____ : _____	
	9	Discussion of "Distinguished Teachers."	

Sociology 651
College Teaching
Winter, 1977

Dr. Wagenaar
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Texts: Eble, The Craft of Teaching

Liebert, "Goals in Teaching Undergraduates"
(American Sociologist, Nov. 75) (handout)

Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives

Marshall and Hales, Essentials of Testing

McKeachie, Teaching Tips

Selected Memos to the Faculty (Univ. of Michigan) (handouts)

Davis, Teaching Strategies in the College Classroom (reserve)

Eble, Professors as Teachers, Chaps. 3 and 4 (reserve)

Skinner, Technology of Teaching, Chaps. 1-3 (reserve)

Selected articles from Journal of Higher Education (reserve)

1. Ability to write good behavioral objectives and assess their attainment
2. Familiarity with taxonomy of educational objectives
3. Ability to use audio-visual aids and recognize their utility
4. Awareness of various teaching techniques and strategies and ability to recognize when each is most appropriate--e.g., lecture, small groups, role playing, simulation, etc.
5. Ability to identify key components of the effective teacher
6. Ability to identify key components of effective teaching
7. Familiarity with a limited amount of research on teaching
8. Familiarity with a limited amount of literature on student evaluation of instruction
9. Familiarity with audio-tutorial methods
10. Cognizance of role of professor in university organization
11. Ability to construct and evaluate test items of different types
12. Familiarity with some of the nitty-gritty elements of college teaching (e.g., student excuses, amount of work, amount of authority)
13. Ability and practice in planning a complete course
14. Familiarity with essentials of educational psychology as applied to college students
15. Practice in teaching and teaching assessments via microteaching and apprenticeship.

OVER

Major Activities:

1. read all assigned materials
2. complete all 12 units on teaching at AV Center (Purdue-Exxon modules)
3. write behavior objectives for intro course
4. plan complete course, including plans for at least 3 different modes of instruction and selection of appropriate AV materials.
5. participation of 3 microteaching sessions, the last of which will be "graded"
6. observe classes of 3 professors and complete short report
7. 3 short exams, mostly essay
8. one final paper, which is to be a letter written to a friend who is very interested in teaching and has been assigned a course, but knows little about teaching (details later)

Outline of semester:

Week	Topics
1	The role of sociology in the liberal arts curriculum; learning theory
2	Behavioral objectives: how to write, use, and evaluate objectives; some cautions and shortcomings regarding behavioral objectives.
3	Lecturing as a teaching method.
4	Small groups, role-playing, simulation, discussion, and case studies.
5	Components and determinants of effective teachers and teaching.
6	Audio-visual aids and self-instruction methods
7	Testing and student evaluation of teaching
8	The "nitty-gritty" of teaching
9 through 13	Apprenticeship: classroom experience, supervised by members of departmental faculty (conferences to be scheduled)
14	Role of professor in university organization (guest lecture by Provost)
15	Summary and review of apprenticeship experience.

Evaluation:

--One fourth of grade based on course planned by student

--One fourth of grade based on microteaching and apprenticeship (grade determined by supervising instructor and myself)

--One fourth of grade based on the 3 exams

--One fourth of grade based on final paper and short assignments

NOTE: Class participation is not formally graded, but is encouraged and will be used in borderline cases. Also, the grading of teaching performance will incorporate student self-evaluation and discussion with instructor.

Short Syllabus for Seminar on College Teaching

Education 600 LEX # 7335 300 Modules or 3 Credits
Wednesdays, 2:00 - 5:00 P.M.
Spring, 1976 Classroom: Room 323 Hills North

Sher Riechmann -- 545-0868 (office)
532-3550 (home)
Office hours: GRC, 125A, Monday 1:00 - 5:00 or by arrangement

Libby Klemer -- 545-0068 (office)
256-0546 (home)
Office hours: GRC, 125A, Tuesday 8:00 - 12:00 noon

Readings: Will include Teaching Tips for the Beginning College Teacher (McKeachie), Discovering Your Teaching Self (Curwin and Fuhrmann), A handbook of Faculty Development (Berquist and Phillips) and selected readings.

Introduction and Perspective

We work at the Center for Instructional Resources and Improvemtnt (CIRI). Our interests include improving and evaluating college teaching; faculty and student classroom roles; the historical, sociological and philosophical foundations of higher education; expanding the goals of higher education; and growth of individuals within teaching/learning contexts. In addition to these areas, a primary interest we both share is that of teaching. We are looking forward to this semester with you. If the office hours are not convenient, please feel free to make an appointment for a time which is.

Course Aims

The aims of this course are to help its participants:

1. explore and state their philosophy of education and assumptions about learning.

2. Become aware of their own teaching and learning styles and the consequences of these styles for themselves as teachers and learners.

3. Begin ways to deal with issues related to teaching such as sexism and racism in the classroom, the relationship (or lack of it) between student affairs and academic affairs, the multiple service research and teaching roles of faculty, and special concerns of teaching in non-school setting.

4. Try out and be exposed to a number of alternative strategies, approaches or methods for teaching.

5. Diagnose their own and others teaching strengths and weaknesses, as well as practice ways to give and work with feedback about teaching.

6. Use a variety of available resources (e.g., videotape, books) for improving and expanding teaching effectiveness.

7. Develop a complete course plan for a course in their own discipline or area of interest.

8. Do a project which will provide information for their potential career as a teacher in a setting where they might be working, such as primary schools, colleges, universities, or prisons.

Class sessions will be used for discussing issues, sharing ideas and resources, practicing skills and evaluating how the course is meeting established goals and student needs.

Course Projects: will include interviewing a faculty member, developing a course, doing some teaching in class, and doing a project on a teaching/learning topic of personal concern.

Format

The course will be divided into three parts. Part I will focus on the foundations and skills of teaching. Part II will focus on a methodology for planning, implementing, and evaluating a course. Part III will be designed primarily to meet the needs and special interests of those enrolled in the course. Possible topics for Part III might include: characteristics of students; evaluation and improvement of college teaching; organizational development in higher education; evaluation of students and grading; and micro-teaching.

Course activities:

1. You will be asked to write a contract about what you would like to do in order to learn about some aspect of college teaching that is particularly interesting or important to you (e.g., effects of tenure; special skills in teaching math; getting ready to teach a course you will be teaching). Your contract should include information on your goals, the activities you've planned to meet those goals, the kind of product(s) you will produce (e.g., course description, survey results, etc.), deadlines for when you will complete particular activities or projects, and an indication of how you want your efforts to be evaluated. In other words, the contract needs to include statements of the following:

a) the problem or area you plan to address
b) what goals you want to accomplish for yourself in this area
c) the activities you will engage in to meet your goals
d) the products to result from your activities
e) deadlines for when activities and/or products will be completed
f) how you want your efforts and/or products evaluated.

You will be asked to share your contract for the course with Sher and Libby. The final contract you work on needs to be accepted as clear and possible by you, Sher, and Libby.

2. Whether we are aware of it or not, our philosophies of education, teaching, and learning affect what we do and are comfortable with as teachers. To study the reality of this statement, you are asked to do two things described below:

a) Interview a full-time faculty person about her/his philosophy of education and assumptions about teaching and learning. Questions asked should include the following:

1) What is your philosophy of education?
2) What are your assumptions about how people learn?
3) What do you feel is the role of teacher in the classroom?
4) What teaching techniques do you presently use and which have you tried and abandoned?
5) How do you feel about teaching as a profession for yourself?

After the interview, write a short paper discussing how the answers to these questions fit and don't fit together. Include what the implications are of what this teacher said for you and how you will or do teach.

b) Write your own philosophy of education and assumptions about teaching and learning. To do that, you might try answering the questions listed above for asking another teacher.
Prepare enough copies of this to share with each member of the class.

3. Each of you will be asked to work on a team which will act as a discussion facilitator for some part of the reading list. There are a number of different techniques that can be used to facilitate discussion. Experiencing some of these techniques and evaluating their effectiveness will hopefully enhance our understanding of the reading, as well as give us some insights into different techniques for discussing reading material.

Each team will also be responsible for reading supplemental books or articles on the topic for which they lead the discussion. They will be responsible for designing, implementing a session to "present" what they feel are the most important ideas or issues in the material. They will also be responsible for designing an evaluation procedure for assessing 'student's' learning of the <u>content</u> of the session and satisfaction with the <u>processes</u> used to present the material. This is a chance to try some teaching techniques you haven't used before. Get us all involved with your presentation.

4. Each of you will be asked to participate in class sessions. Some of these sessions, as indicated above, will be led by those enrolled in the course and some by Sher and Libby. You will be asked to indicate special topics or skills you would like to have addressed which are not topics on the reading list, as well as those on the reading list you would like to have emphasized.

<u>Grading</u>

Grades are on a Pass/Fail basis unless requested otherwise. For those needing grades, they will be based upon the following:

a) Projects from Part I - faculty interview and philosophy of educ. paper
b) Project from Part II to consist of a course design in the student's field including goals, objectives, format and evaluation
c) Development and completion of an acceptable individual contract and the project agreed upon in the contract.

Guidelines for projects will be provided on the short syllabus.

BRIEF OVERVIEW

SEMINAR ON COLLEGE TEACHING

- Part I -

This section of the course is designed to get you in touch with your feelings, values and ideas about teaching. We will ask you to do this through readings, classroom exercises and discussions, and through conversations/interviews with faculty and administrators on campus.

January 28 -- Effective Teachers - Myth or Reality!

1. Introductions
2. Explanation of course
3. Encounter 1984
4. Research on effective teachers

Assignment: Explanation of faculty interview and philosophy of education paper due on 2/11

February 4 -- Faculty Role Perceptions

1. Chronology of research
2. Teaching viewed from a roles perspective
3. Summary of role findings

Assignment: First draft of contracts due
Reminder: Faculty interviews and own philosophy of education
Paper due next class

February 11 -- Philosophy of Education

1. Assumptions about knowledge, learning and the learner
2. Encounter 1984 re-visited
3. Discussion of faculty interviews

February 18 -- Speaker on Issues in Higher Education

February 25 -- TBa

1. Complete teaching and working on Curwin & Fuhrmann by this date
2. Determination of format for part 3

- Part II -

Special readings will be provided or suggested for each class session in this part. Each class session will include (1) some format for dealing with information in the readings; (2) an experiential activity to help you think through your ideas and values/or practice skills; (3) a lead-in for your out-of-class work on that topic which will be due the following class. At the end of part II, you should have ideas about how to plan, implement, and evaluate courses, as well as actual practice in each of these areas, and plans for one unit of a course you would some day like to teach.

March 3 -- Planning a Course or Unit of Instruction

1. Course-planning exercise
2. Objectives - behavioral or not?
3. Examining values in teaching a particular course

Assignment: Write brief overview and objectives for your course or unit of course

March 10 -- Choosing Teaching Strategies: Matching Methods With Desired Outcomes
1. Read McKeachie

Assignment: Plan methods for achieving objectives of unit

March 17 -- Implementing Methods
1. Micro-teaching sessions

Assignment: In-class practice teaching and giving feedback to other teachers

March 24 -- VACATION

March 31 -- Student Course and Teaching Evaluation

Assignment: Design evaluation items to test student learning and teaching effectiveness

- Part III -

April 7 -- Actual content and format to be determined by 2/25/76

April 14 -- TBA

April 21 -- TBA

April 28 -- TBA
1. Draft of contract project due of feedback from class or Sher and Libby is desired before final due date

May 5 -- TBA

May 12 -- Course Evaluation and Wrap-Up
1. Final project for contract due

A Graduate Course in the Teaching of Psychology: Description and Evaluation[1]

FRANK COSTIN

Demands for the improvement of college teaching are increasing, not only in educational writings but also in literary magazines and journals of current affairs (1, 3). Much of the discussion has focused on the widespread use of teaching assistants, especially in our large colleges and universities, and the poor teaching that frequently accompanies this practice.

One of the most persistent criticisms is that teaching assistants receive inadequate training for their jobs. A recent survey (4) disclosed that, although some departments in colleges and universities have developed formal training procedures designed specifically for their teaching assistants, relatively few maintain permanent programs, and the few that are maintained tend to be superficial. For example, less than 10 percent of the programs gave systematic instruction in how to plan courses, methods of classroom teaching, or evaluation of student performance; fewer than half provided any direct supervision of the teaching assistants' activities; and less than a third evaluated their teaching ability.

It might be that more colleges and universities would develop permanent programs aimed at remedying the defects just mentioned if they had at hand specific formats and procedures to help them get started, particularly those that have already been demonstrated and evaluated. The purpose of this article, therefore, is to describe an approach that seems to be working successfully, a seminar in the teaching of psychology that can be used not only by departments of psychology but also by other academic departments as an initial model in the training of their teaching assistants.

1. A briefer version of this paper was presented at the symposium on "College Teaching as Part of Graduate Training," Seventy-Fifth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1, 1967. John Stapert assisted in processing the evaluation data.

Dr. Costin is professor of psychology, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Volume XIX Number 4 Winter 1968

JOURNAL of TEACHER EDUCATION

Description of Seminar

The seminar, "Principles and Methods of Teaching Psychology," was initiated at the University of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana campus) in 1964. Offered each semester, it now has an enrollment of about fifteen students, meeting for two hours a week. The seminar carries academic credit, is open to any student who has completed at least one year of graduate work in psychology, and is required of all students who expect to be teaching assistants in the Department of Psychology or who have already started to teach. Since all graduate students in the Department are urged to acquire some teaching experience before they finish their degree programs, a large majority of them eventually become teaching assistants for at least one year. Most of them manage to take the course while they are teaching, although conflicts in class schedules or the press of other duties prevents some from enrolling at the time they first begin to teach.

The general objectives of the seminar are to help students get ready for the teaching assistant jobs they expect to assume in the Department of Psychology, to improve the performance of those assistants who have already started to teach, and to help all students prepare for the various teaching positions in which they may be engaged after they have finished their graduate work. The seminar is therefore a regular part of graduate education as well as an in-service training program.

The content of the course is divided into eight areas, four of which are covered during the first half of the semester in the following sequence, developing course objectives, selecting and organizing course content, planning and handling teaching-learning situations, and evaluating the attainment of course objectives. (This sequence reflects a basic approach to curriculum development and instruction propounded for many years by Ralph Tyler and his followers.) The remaining four areas are covered during the second half of the seminar: special aspects of teacher-student relationships (e.g., advising and counseling), ethics in teaching, issues of teaching versus research, and research problems in the teaching of psychology. (Although some discussion of research problems inevitably occurs from time to time throughout the course, the area is considered more formally at this stage by having several students present to the seminar brief descriptions of research problems they would like to investigate.) The sequence of the last four areas is rather flexible, depending largely on what the majority of the group wants to do.

Although all eight areas receive some attention during the seminar sessions, the extent to which specific topics within an area are discussed usually varies from one semester to another according to the special interests expressed by seminar members.

In addition to participating in the weekly sessions, students are expected to read widely among the topics listed in the seminar outline. Everyone is asked to read certain references that serve as a common background for discussions and demonstrations during the sessions; other references are designed to help a student pursue more deeply a particular topic in which he is interested and to help him prepare an individual project required of all students. Many kinds of projects have

been completed; some of the more popular are (a) detailed course outlines, including statements of objectives, content, activities, and evaluation procedures; (b) critical essays on such issues as ethics in teaching and the "publish-or-perish" argument; (c) course examinations, accompanied by charts showing the relevance of items to course objectives and content; (d) presentation of a 30-minute lecture followed by the seminar's critique.

Evaluation of Seminar: Opinions of Participants

The opinions of 65 students, constituting practically all those who had completed the course, were obtained over a three-year period by means of anonymous questionnaires. The first part of the questionnaire listed 24 topics; students were asked to indicate on a scale from 3 to 1 whether it was "very important," "moderately important," or "slightly important" for each topic to have been included in the seminar, regardless of the extent to which it had been discussed during a session. The following six topics received ratings above 2.50 and thus were closer to "very important" than to "moderately important":

1. Developing course objectives that involve cognitive change
2. Choosing evaluation procedures that are consistent with course objectives
3. Developing and presenting lectures
4. Using discussion methods
5. Using objectives as guides for selecting course content
6. Determining course grades

These highly rated topics include not only the practical everyday work of a college teacher but also the specific aspects of the four areas that represent a basic approach to instruction.

A second group of six topics, receiving mean ratings ranging from 2.45 to 2.25, was somewhat above the "moderately important" level but closer to it than to the "very important":

1. Organizing course content into sequences of topics
2. Developing course objectives that involve attitudinal changes
3. Teaching versus research: issues, dilemmas, solutions
4. Ethics of teaching
5. Methods of measuring attitudinal course outcomes
6. Locating sources for course materials

Although the emphasis in this group was still on the central work of the classroom instructor, it included also the broader topics of ethics and teaching versus research.

The third group of six topics clustered closely around "moderately important," with a range of ratings from 2.0 to 2.18:

1. Methods of measuring cognitive outcomes
2. Problems of learning and studying
3. Students' evaluation of instruction
4. Research problems on the teaching of psychology
5. Problems of discipline and morale
6. Advising and counseling

The fourth group received mean ratings between "moderately important" and "slightly important" (1.92 to 1.53):

1. Laboratory methods
2. Problems of emotional adjustment
3. Independent study

After the rating of seminar topics, students were asked four open-ended ques-

tions. These are listed below, with the percentage of students giving each response:

1. What kinds of activities carried on *during* the seminar sessions did you find especially helpful for learning how to teach psychology?
   a. Demonstrations of discussion methods and our evaluation of them (51 percent)
   b. Demonstration lectures and our evaluation of them (48 percent)
   c. General, free-for-all discussion (28 percent)
   d. Presentation of research projects and our discussion of them (20 percent).
2. What kinds of activities carried on *outside* seminar sessions did you find especially helpful for learning how to teach psychology?
   a. Reading the references listed in the seminar outline (38 percent)
   b. Preparing individual projects (35 percent)
   c. Preparing test items according to taxonomic principles (28 percent)
   d. Developing course objectives according to taxonomic principles (20 percent)
   e. Preparing lectures for presentation in seminar (20 percent)
3. What suggestions do you have for activities in future seminars?
   a. More demonstrations of discussion methods (38 percent)
   b. Have seminar leader observe assistant's classroom teaching and discuss observations with him (31 percent)
   c. More demonstration lectures (28 percent)
   d. More research projects presented during a seminar session (20 percent)
4. What was the most important contribution the seminar made to your development as a teacher?
   a. Gave me more insight into the available methods of teaching (48 percent)
   b. Increased my awareness of how important it is to plan course objectives (38 percent)
   c. Made me more aware of the kinds of problems encountered in teaching (32 percent)
   d. Helped me to be more self-critical about my teaching (28 percent)
   e. Stimulated my desire to do research on teaching (20 percent)

Evaluation of Seminar: Teaching Behavior

In addition to the opinions of its participants, the seminar was also evaluated by comparing the teaching behavior of two groups of assistants in their first year of teaching: those who had participated in the seminar and those who had not yet enrolled. About 80 percent of them taught in the largest course in the Department, "Introduction to Psychology," which treats psychology as a social science. The remaining 20 percent were involved in two other courses: "Human Behavior," which has a physiological orientation, and "Introduction to Social Psychology." All three courses have both lecture and discussion sessions: lectures are given by full-time faculty members, who have primary responsibility for the courses; and discussion sessions by the teaching assistants. In the case of "Human Behavior," assistants also teach laboratory sessions.

TABLE 1

Items Used by Students in Rating Their Teaching Assistants

Scoring System

First Item:	*All Other Items:*
Outstanding and stimulating (5)	5-point scale from "almost always occurred" (5) to "almost never occurred" (1)
Very good (4)	
Good (3)	
Adequate but not stimulating (2)	
Poor and inadequate (1)	

Factors and Items

Skill

- How would you rate your instructor in general (all-round) teaching ability?
- Instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.
- He put his material across in an interesting way.
- He stimulated the intellectual curiosity of his students.
- He explained clearly and his explanations were to the point.

Structure

- The instructor decided in detail what should be done and how.
- He followed an outline closely.
- He had everything going according to schedule.
- He planned the activities of each class period in detail.

Feedback

- Instructor told students when they had done a particularly good job.
- He complimented a student on his work in front of others.
- He criticized poor work.

Group Interaction

- The students in the class were friendly.
- In this class, I felt free to express my opinion.
- Students argued with one another or with the instructor, not necessarily with hostility.
- Students frequently volunteered their own opinions.

Student-Teacher Rapport

- Instructor listened attentively to what class members had to say.
- He was friendly.
- He was permissive and flexible.
- He explained the reasons for his criticisms.

Table 1 shows the items students used in rating their assistants and the factors they represent (names of factors did not appear on the rating form). Items and factors were developed by a University of Michigan group headed by Isaacson, McKeachie, and Milholland (2). For purposes of this evaluation, only those items were used that had the highest factor loadings and were most relevant to the work of the teaching assistants.

Ratings of assistants were obtained at three different times during the academic year: middle of the first semester, end of the first semester, and end of the second semester. Students were asked to put a code name on their rating scales so that their mid-course ratings could be compared with their end-of-course ratings during the first semester, without sacrificing the anonymity promised them. The following findings are based on cumulative data gathered in this way over a two-year period.

Table 2 shows the mean factor scores received by assistants during their first semester of teaching. Changes in the mean ratings of assistants who had taken the seminar during that semester or during the summer session just preceding were compared with changes in the mean ratings of those who had not yet enrolled in the seminar. Analysis of covariance was used to adjust the actual mean ratings the two groups received at the end of the semester; this was done to compensate for the differences in mean ratings existing

TABLE 2

Student Ratings Received by Teaching Assistants in Psychology at the Middle and End of a Semester

S = 27 assistants participating in seminar on teaching			NS = 22 assistants not participating in seminar			
Classroom Behavior Rated by Students	*Mean Rating: Midsemester*		*Mean Rating: End of semester*		*Adjusted Mean Rating: End of semester*	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
Skill	3.17	3.37	3.41	3.35	3.49	3.27
Structure	2.73	2.89	2.84	2.97	2.92	2.90
Feedback	2.41	2.53	2.59	2.58	2.63	2.54
Interaction	3.45	3.37	3.73	3.62	3.75	3.59
Rapport	4.01	4.13	4.21	4.14	4.24[a]	4.11[a]

Note: Adjusted mean ratings were determined by analysis of covariance.
[a] t for difference = 2.06, $p < .05$

between the two groups at mid-semester. These adjusted means, listed in the last two columns of Table 2, were compared in order to see whether the two groups of assistants differed in the amount of change in their mean ratings.

As Table 2 shows, assistants who had participated in the seminar made a significantly greater gain in *student-teacher rapport*, although the magnitude of the difference was small. (It will also be noted that both groups received their highest mean ratings for this factor.) The adjusted mean scores of the seminar group were also higher than those of the nonseminar group for the other four factors, but none of these differences were significant.

Stability coefficients for students' ratings were generally satisfactory. Correlations between midsemester and end-of-semester mean ratings of the 22 assistants who had not participated in the seminar ranged from .68 to .84, except for the factor, *group interaction*, whose stability coefficient was .41. Of further interest, particularly for those who might wish to use the scale with teachers in other disciplines, was the finding that 23 teaching assistants in courses in humanities, physical sciences, social sciences, and biological sciences all received student ratings whose stability coefficients (midsemester versus end of semester) ranged from .87 to .70, except for the factor, *group interaction*, whose coefficient was .48.

The comparisons between seminar and nonseminar assistants described in Table 2 were only for the first semester in which they taught. Table 3 shows the results of comparing some of these assistants during two consecutive semesters. The number who could thus be compared was necessarily reduced: first, because shifts in enrollment forced several assistants who had

TABLE 3

Student Ratings Received by Teaching Assistants in Psychology During Two Consecutive Semesters

S = 21 assistants participating in seminar on teaching during first semester or preceding summer session

NS = 21 assistants who had not participated in seminar

Classroom Behavior Rated by Students	Mean Rating: Middle of 1st semester		Mean Rating: End of 1st semester		Mean Rating: End of 2nd semester		Adjusted Mean Rating: End of 1st semester		Adjusted Mean Rating: End of 2nd semester	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
Skill	3.19	3.29	3.30	3.38	3.61	3.56	3.35	3.34	3.62	3.54
Structure	2.62	2.77	2.72	2.87	2.99	3.09	2.79	2.80	3.02	3.06
Feedback	2.42	2.59	2.48	2.68	2.92	2.56	2.55	2.61	2.97[b]	2.51[b]
Interaction	3.45	3.69	3.67	3.70	3.89	3.64	3.77[a]	3.61[a]	3.90[c]	3.63[c]
Rapport	4.04	4.10	4.19	4.13	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.21	4.31	4.24

Note: Mean ratings obtained at the end of the first semester were adjusted for differences between mid-semester means; the mean ratings obtained at the end of the second semester were adjusted for differences between means which occurred at the end of the first semester.

[a] t for difference = 1.87, $.10 > p > .05$
[b] t for difference = 2.10, $p < .05$
[c] t for difference = 2.25, $p < .05$

participated in the seminar during the first semester to transfer at the second semester to courses not included in this study; and second, some who had not participated in the seminar during the first semester joined it during the second.

Table 3, then, compares two groups: the *S* group, consisting of assistants who had taken the seminar during their first semester of teaching or in the summer session just preceding it, and the *NS* group, consisting of those who also taught both semesters but who had not yet taken the seminar.

Comparisons of adjusted mean ratings at the end of the first semester showed no significant differences between the seminar and the nonseminar groups; in the case of *group interaction*, the difference approached the 5 percent level of significance, the seminar group having gained a slightly higher mean rating. Comparisons of adjusted mean ratings at the end of the second semester, however, revealed two significant differences: one for *feedback* and the other for *group interaction*. In each instance, the seminar group received higher mean ratings than did the nonseminar group.

In the light of the results of these comparisons of teaching behavior, it would appear that the seminar was reasonably suc-

ceseful in helping assistants to develop more positive interpersonal relationships in their classrooms.

Conclusion

Although the seminar described in this paper was restricted to the teaching of psychology, the opinions expressed by participants concerning the topics and activities, their suggestions for further seminars, and the results of comparing their teaching behavior with that of assistants who did not participate in the seminar should be highly relevant also for the training of college teachers in a wide variety of academic disciplines.

References

1. Fischer, J. "Is There a Teacher on the Faculty?" *Harper's* 30: 18+; February 1965.
2. Isaacson, R. L., and others. "Dimensions of Student Evaluations of Teaching." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 55: 344-51; December 1964.
3. Lee, C. B. T., editor. *Improving College Teaching.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.
4. University of Michigan, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. "Memo to the Faculty, No. 13." Ann Arbor: the University, 1963.

The Citizen Exchange Corps Field Institute
A Program of East-West, Cross-Cultural Education

Since 1966, the Citizen Exchange Corps Field Institute has conducted a unique course in the USSR for undergraduate and graduate students and other Americans in careers and professions. The Field Institute is a division of the Citizen Exchange Corps (CEC), a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization founded in 1961.

In 1963, after years of careful preparation, the CEC began to conduct large-scale exchanges between American and Soviet citizens as a step toward mutual understanding. The Field Institute became part of CEC's program the following year. Among the unique features of the Field Institute program are a combined American and Soviet faculty drawn from leading universities in the US and USSR; emphasis on close observation of Soviet society through field trips to Soviet institutions and counterpart meetings between Americans and Soviets with similar occupations or interests; participation in each group by Americans of all ages and backgrounds; and practical application of CEC's philosophy of mutual understanding.

Course content and organization of the curriculum are the responsibility of the Academic Council which runs the Field Institute. Among the Council members are: Dr. J. William Frey, Franklin and Marshall College; Professor Gerald Franks, Ohio University; Dr. Charles Gribble, Brandeis University; Dr. Samuel Hendel, City College of New York; Dr. Norman Henley, Johns Hopkins University; Dr. George Kline, Bryn Mawr College; Dr. Max Mark, Wayne State University; Dr. Richard Mills, Fordham University; Dr. Henry Morton, Queens College; Dr. Richard Renfield, Communications Satellite Corporation; and Dean Leonard Zion, Brandeis University.

The duration of the exchange visit in the USSR is three weeks. The curriculum consists

(Continued on page 470)

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MASSACHUSETTS HALL
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

April, 1976

Dear Colleague:

Early last fall I asked you to answer a few questions about your hiring practices for new junior faculty members. You generously took the time to complete our questionnaire, and we are now sending you the results, which document the relative importance of teaching and scholarship in hiring decisions.

The conclusion I found especially provocative was that if better ways of transmitting information about teaching ability were available (e.g., videotape, reports from those who have observed the candidate in the classroom, student evaluations), more weight would be given by many of you to teaching ability in making these decisions. Because of my concern with helping to improve the quality of teaching here at Harvard and in colleges and universities around the country, I will be interested to see if better ways to evaluate teaching ability indeed can be developed and used effectively by hiring committees. I hope that those of you with a special interest in the quality of teaching will be encouraged by this study to participate actively in such a development.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation.

Sincerely,

Derek C. Bok

OVER

HIRING PRACTICES FOR NEW JUNIOR FACULTY- - -

How much importance is given to teaching ability in the hiring of assistant professors in leading American universities and colleges? This question was explored in a recent survey conducted by the Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation at Harvard. The objective of the study was to determine whether recent expressions of interest in good teaching reflect a fundamental change in how educational institutions view their responsibilities. In fact, how much interest is there in the quality of teaching and how much weight do those responsible for hiring give to teaching ability? The results of this survey of 1145 deans and department chairmen* in 222 major colleges and universities indicate that the criteria used for selecting new faculty members are as follows:

Evidence of scholarly ability	49%
Evidence of teaching ability	37%
All other considerations	13%

While scholarly excellence has always been a dominant influence in the selection process, these figures show that teaching ability is also very important. Departments differ, of course, in the degree to which their members emphasize scholarly and teaching strengths. Those in the natural sciences weight research work most heavily, particularly within the field of physics - yet the percentage of consideration given to scholarship in the making of junior appointments has dropped over the last five years, from 59 to 56 percent. Humanities departments stress teaching the most; for example, English departments give scholarship an emphasis of only 43 percent in the hiring decision.

A third of the respondents to the survey stated that teaching ability is now a more important element in their appointment decisions than it was 5 to 10 years ago, while a majority felt that there has been no change in emphasis. A few respondents mentioned that teaching had been overemphasized at their particular college in the last five years and that they are now taking advantage of the "soft" academic market to strengthen their level of scholarly excellence. They feel that they can do this without sacrificing the qualities of interest and competence in teaching.

Public universities have increased the weight given to teaching ability as a selection criteria more than private universities have; this increase was greater in both the smaller and larger public institutions than in those with undergraduate enrollments of 10,000 to 20,000. Of the nine departments surveyed, psychology, physics and history showed the greatest increase in emphasizing teaching ability as a criterion of selection.

Most of those responsible for faculty hiring point to problems in judging both scholarly promise and teaching abilities. A candidate's dissertation, publications and other written materials are of primary importance; a candidate's abilities to conduct a seminar is the preferred second mode; letters of recommendation rank third; while academic (grade) record ranks a weak fourth. Like the world's currencies, references and grades, especially the latter, have been devalued by inflation, their importance consequently reduced.

In order to evaluate a candidate's teaching ability, most deans and department chairmen currently rely on recommendations of those who are familiar with the candidate's strengths as a teacher and on the extent of the applicant's previous teaching experience. A majority (69%) of the respondents suggested that they would give more weight in hiring decisions to teaching ability if there were more reliable methods of evaluating it (for example, firsthand faculty observation of the candidate's teaching). Seventy percent suggested that student evaluations would be useful. A third indicated that they would consider participation by a prospective candidate in a seminar on instructional techniques as positive evidence of one's commitment to teaching. Interestingly 81% mentioned that they would welcome a videotape of a class taught by the candidate as specific evidence of teaching ability.

---

*Chemistry, Economics, English, History, Mathematics, Political Science/Government, Psychology and Romance Languages.

Teaching is the primary task of the majority of faculty members, and most departments do weight teaching heavily in making hiring decisions. Yet most graduate programs include little training or preparation for the future college teacher. The Center for Teaching and Learning at Harvard, one of five funded by the Danforth Foundation, is currently involved in such programs, primarily for graduate teaching fellows. Along with similar programs and institutions throughout the country, the Center is motivated by the conviction that good teachers are the practitioners of a humane art whose skills can be isolated and mastered. Whatever the teacher's style or personality, his or her teaching can be improved, benefitting both students and teachers as well as the university itself.

OVER

SOME PROS and SOME CONS on COURSES, PROGRAMS OR WORKSHOPS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS ON TEACHING -- Generated at Morning Session, 21 July

Pros

1. Potentially, such programs can provide feedback on teaching--feedback that is often difficult to obtain in classes and "business as usual."
2. Support from Peers
3. It is professionally responsible to hold such programs, courses, etc.
4. An assist to graduate students in job market
5. Programs such as these can be threatening to the faculty and can disrupt that departmental status quo.
6. Programs can help socialize graduate students--provide increased legitimacy to teaching--boost the value of teaching
7. An aid to departmental survival--help keep students in classes, etc.
8. Programs can develop a personal awareness that teaching improvement requires conscious work by the individual.
9. Programs such as these can try to insure that new teachers do not have to reinvent the wheel--we can draw on other disciplines and prior work.
10. Helps graduate students find our more about learning sociology
11. Can give people some competencies and skills in teaching, help them develop these-- competencies which can lead to them enjoying teaching because they will be more effective at it.
12. Screening out of people not interested in, or willing to work at teaching (a la medical school screening ....)
13. Can provide a tool kit (of models, styles, approaches, techniques (including research on teaching where it is sound) with which people can build their own teaching styles, etc.

Cons

1. Standardization of bad teaching could result--bad examples, limited alternatives, lack of diversity.
2. Lowers the number of other (substantive, sociology) courses graduate students would be able to take (on a zero-sum assumption)
3. Courses such as these may not screen out bad teaching and they assume that everyone has potential for being an effective teacher
4. Threatening to faculty, distruptive of department all status quo
5. Programs build on guilt--and after all, teaching is not the only that sociology and grad school in sociology is about.
6. Can alter the program of sociology
7. The results may be insubstantial--is such an enterprise worth the time invested? Could it be better used?
8. Encroachment on the work of educationalists--and it assumes they know something about teaching
9. LBKOT - Little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing
10. Threatening to graduate students
11. Programs such as these would divert attention from research and the development of the discipline, the corpus of sociology
12. Teaching is not a science nor a craft--pure art, an activity or set of relationships unique and not amenable to careful specification, measurement and conscious activity.

PROFESSIONAL PROBLEMS:

PREPARATION FOR A CAREER IN COLLEGE TEACHING

Frank W. Finger

April, 1970

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle - Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

Report 1

FOREWORD

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, one of a network of clearinghouses established by the U.S. Office of Education, is concerned with undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. As well as abstracting and indexing significant, current documents in its field, the Clearinghouse prepares its own and commissions outside works on various aspects of higher education.

To afford wider distribution of this useful paper which deals with many aspects of the preparation of college teachers, we asked Frank W. Finger, professor of psychology at the University of Virginia, to expand on an article that appeared in the November 1969 issue of the *American Psychologist*. (Permission was granted by the American Psychological Association for its adaptation.) For the past twenty years, Professor Finger has offered a seminar to graduate students who are planning to become college teachers. His course, "Professional Problems," is one of the few efforts being made to introduce prospective teachers to the world of higher education.

The Clearinghouse is currently engaged in a related project, the compilation of a compendium including descriptions of studies on the preparation of college teachers, ongoing programs, and proposals for new graduate degrees. It will be available from the Clearinghouse in June 1970.

Carl J. Lange, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
April 1970

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

In contrast to the practitioners of other professions, the typical college teacher is thrown into his first job with little training in the primary skills that he is expected to exercise, and with minimal appreciation of the complexity of his professorial position. It seems to be tacitly assumed that mastery of the subject matter of his discipline automatically confers the ability to communicate it effectively to students, to give competent educational and personal counsel, to participate wisely in curriculum evaluation and reform, to help guide the institution in its relations with the larger community, to acquire a new book or piece of equipment in spite of administrative red tape, to differentiate between the SDS and the NSA, and to secure a federal grant for educational innovation or summer research. In the absence of supplementary indoctrination by the employing institution, any self-doubts the new teacher may have are probably valid.

Specific efforts to ameliorate this situation have been described from time to time (e.g., Costin, 1968; Dunkel, 1958). Moreover, the employment of graduate students as teaching assistants provides, in some universities, a sort of on-the-job training (Koen, 1968; Nowlis, 1968). One of the most effective current programs combines the resources of several academic departments and the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan. And the University of Utah schedules a five-day workshop for teaching assistants preceding the beginning of the fall semester; departments are responsible for the follow-up during the year.

With few exceptions, however, these programs appear to be too vaguely planned and loosely administered to qualify as professional preparation. Perhaps this represents a justifiable reluctance to suggest prescriptions for an area in which satisfactory criteria of success are extremely elusive and even the underlying objectives are often subject to inconclusive debate. Or there may be fear that the intrusion of any significant amount of "methods" or "philosophy" of higher education would fatally dilute the departmental curriculum.

Default by inaction is not the only alternative to the threats of dogmatism and imbalance. Over the past 20 years, I have offered a two-semester graduate seminar entitled "Professional Problems," which attempts to steer a reasonable course between these extremes. I proceed on the assumption that, while I am short of final answers, I am pretty well acquainted with the variety of problems of the academic world, and can at least alert the prospective teacher to their existence. I can, by my own account and through exposure to the professional literature, introduce him to the alternative approaches to their solution. I hope I can coax him into the persisting habit of reading appropriate material, of evaluating and challenging his own pedagogical preconceptions, of developing new ideas and subjecting them to discussion and pragmatic test.

As a preface to the detailed description of the course, a number of general characteristics that probably contribute to its success should be noted.

1. Only students in the latter half of the graduate program are eligible to enroll. They have essentially completed their course work and passed the qualifying examinations for the doctorate, and thus can begin to accept me more as colleague than critic. To emphasize this relationship, we usually agree that the grade report, unfortunately still required by the registrar, will ordinarily be unaffected by course performance. Indeed, I use such terms as "course" and "student" only for convenience, and with apology for their inappropriateness.

2. Inclusion in the group is by mutual desire and consent. This stipulation, while admittedly stacking the cards in my favor, has the desirable result of keeping enrollment within the optimal range of seven to ten.

3. None of us claims omniscience. We do take turns preparing background material and directing the conversation, but any tendency to take the assigned role of "expert" too seriously can be expected to provoke polite skepticism if not vigorous resistance, especially when we proceed from "fact" to interpretation and recommendation. Appeal to authority is also unlikely to shut off debate, for it becomes apparent early in the year that the literature is more often marked by diversity of opinion than unanimity. Our objective is less to achieve consensus than to become aware of alternative positions and to nurture a perpetual willingness to entertain new points of view.

4. The "noncourse" atmosphere is enhanced by meeting in the evening, weekly, in the quasi-social setting of our several homes. The typical session lasts for three or four hours, interrupted midway by a pause for refreshment.

5. The order of topics and the time spent on each vary from year to year, depending upon the particular enthusiams of the participants, where or what "the action" presently is, and our fluctuations of mood.

6. Our discussions are based, when possible, upon prior preparation. There is no single textbook, although Buxton (1956) and Lee (1967) are very useful as starters. From our basic list of several dozen book titles and serials, each student during the year will browse through 15 or 20, about half of general interest and the others more or less prescribed for a given week. We maintain currency by regular reading of the *American Psychologist* (psychology's "house organ"), the News and Comments section of *Science*, the *AAUP Bulletin*, and (especially) *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Each student explores one topic in depth, through reading and sometimes a minor research project, and leads its discussion for a session or two. On topics not thus assigned, it is I who must do the principal homework. We all feel free to interject illustrations from our own experience, disguising identities as judgment and taste dictate.

Another source of current literature is *Research in Education*, published monthly by the U.S. Office of Education. A bibliographical guide to its entries on higher education is compiled and published periodically by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

7. Our discussions are often enriched by pertinent reports from previous years' members, by letter, tape, or in person. Other members of the departmental or university staff may join us on request. And the President of the University has accepted our invitation for an interchange of views.

As I have intimated, the correspondence between the list of topics that I originally present to the group and the course as it actually unfolds is less than perfect. Perhaps what follows is most honestly described as one series of events that could occur, not entirely by chance. It should be noted that the course is designed to meet the particular needs of graduate students in psychology. Adaptation of the general plan for use in another department would involve substituting the appropriate terminology at a number of points and eliminating discussion of such relatively esoteric problems as licensure for private practice. Only a few of the references cited depend heavily upon strictly psychological content, and even they may be of illustrative value to specialists in other areas.

Introduction to seminar

I start by outlining my objectives for offering the course, describing a number of actual and abortive attempts at other universities to achieve some of these goals, and speculating a bit why so few programs seem to generate and sustain adequate support. I then outline our anticipated procedure and invite the students to add to my tentative (following) list of topics.

Fields of psychology

With a bow to the breadth implied by the title of the course (devised originally to beguile an overly conservative Graduate Committee and Dean), and to gain some perspective against which to examine academic psychology, we consider the kinds of settings in which psychologists work (Webb, 1962). In each instance, we look at employment statistics, responsibilities, interprofessional relations, range of remuneration and perquisites, training required, patterns of advancement, and probable direction of change. Mobility among the fields, especially in and out of the academic, is noted.

History of academic and professional psychology

The present relationships (including the undoubted tensions) among academic and nonacademic psychologists, and between such divergent academic groups as clinicians and experimentalists, can better be appreciated after studying certain trends and salient events of the past 100 years. One framework that ties together the development of professional psychology and its current status is organization. The origin and growth of the various psychological associations and societies are sketched, with some emphasis on personalities; formal history is supplemented by anecdote. A contemporary analysis of the American Psychological Association is made—structure, functions, politics. We struggle a bit with the proposition that the individual has an obligation to his profession, best met by involvement in the appropriate organizations, however burdensome this may sometimes be. The listing of nonpsychological organizations to which psychologists belong suggests the desirability of ignoring artificial disciplinary boundaries.

History of higher education

Whether certain practices in the modern university exist for currently valid reasons or represent cultural lag can more clearly be judged as their evolution is traced. In the transition from the mid-nineteenth century college to the postwar university (Veysey, 1965), the influence of general national trends is easily discernible; it is an interesting exercise to crystal ball the response of higher education to hypothesized sociopolitical convulsions in the closing decades of the millennium (Eurich, 1968). The proposition that the relationship may be reciprocal underlies our consideration of the potential influence of psychologists and other academic professionals upon public policy.

Governance

The interlocking roles of trustees, legislature (where pertinent), president, deans, chairmen, faculty, alumni, nonteaching staff, and students are examined (Demerath, 1967; Wilson, 1965) with the aid of tables of organization, books and articles by representatives of each group, and my observations. At least one institution and state system, and certainly our own, is analyzed in detail, with some historical background. An attempt is made to differentiate between nominal power and de facto control, with the usual obeisance toward the dean's secretary and the maintenance personnel.

Types of institutions

We enumerate and categorize the institutions of higher learning according to various classification systems, such as size, degrees offered, sources of support, geographical distribution, and characteristics of the student body (Singletary, 1968). It is usually in this context that we compare different types of psychology departments, partly with an eye to future appointments. We ponder the advisability of offering psychology in subcollegiate settings, and occasionally bring the statistics on this practice up to date by mail survey.

Academic freedom and tenure

Judgment by one's peers, as the standard for appropriate professional behavior, is examined as it has been applied to higher education and research (Metzger, 1969). The role of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in the formalization and implementation of the concept of academic freedom, and the more recent evolution of legal precedents, are delineated. It is not difficult to generate debate on the drawbacks and merits of continuous tenure, as both instigation to premature ossification and protection against arbitrary thought control from within and outside the university (Byse and Joughin, 1959).

Student rights and responsibilities

This topic has peculiar relevance at the moment, and there is no end of hot-off-the-press material for discussion. Our leader this year, suggesting the alternative title "The Unreconciled," began with student dissatisfaction with the medieval university, and only after several hours brought us to the barricades of the '60s and the "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students" (Schwartz, 1967). It seemed to us that an important factor in the era of confrontation has been the failure of the teaching profession to accept its proper responsibility for governance and that this is symptomatic of the general unconcern for professional problems that such devices as this seminar are designed to counteract (Schwab, 1969).

Objectives of higher education

The logical first step in establishing a curriculum or planning a course is to decide what changes in the student are sought.

Lists of goals can be found, under such rubrics as liberal education and general education (Williams, 1968). Our agreement on priorities is never perfect, which reassures us that there will always be variety sufficient to accommodate the wide individual differences among eight million collegians. We diverge still further when we try to establish criteria by which achievement of these goals can be demonstrated, which is a source of particular embarrassment to us behavioral scientists. One may, perhaps, be sustained by the faith that any set of objectives is preferable to none, and that one's teaching will surely be more vital if he has at least struggled to formulate a statement of purpose.

Varieties of curriculum

The faculty member will be able to respond better to deficiencies in existing course patterns if he has some appreciation of the alternatives. By report and readings, we are introduced to standard curricula and to examples of experimental programs (Dressel, 1968). We acknowledge the desirability of evaluation, and grapple with the obstacles thereto, especially the distorting effect of novelty itself. Each of us constructs an "ideal" curriculum for some hypothetical population of undergraduates, justifying each characteristic by reference to a guiding set of objectives. In still more detail, we devise and defend schemes for the major in psychology (McKeachie, 1961). The virtues of interdisciplinary courses and majors are weighed, with real and imaginary illustrations.

Course planning

Most of the members of the seminar have had considerable exposure to introductory psychology courses, and many of them have suggestions for improvement (Walker and McKeachie, 1967). The detailed planning of a course brings them a little closer to the harsh realities of personal responsibility. Presentation of the plans to the class usually precipitates further dispute over goals, this time tied more closely to what actually might happen in the classroom. If time permits, each student outlines one advanced course. We inspect critically the various psychology course syllabi available, such as those assembled by the Course-Outlines Project of Division 2 of the American Psychological Association.

Techniques of instruction

While agreeing that no universal formula for success can be given the prospective teacher, we find it valuable to read and talk about the several techniques. I usually start by presenting my own biases with regard to effective lecturing, and the students quickly demonstrate that there are differences of opinion. We proceed to consideration of other teaching methods (Brown, 1963; Skinner, 1968): discussion, seminar, tutorial, laboratory, programed instruction, and their combinations. Uses and abuses of audiovisual aids and demonstrations are weighed. Our discussion is supplemented by (invited) visits to various undergraduate classes.

Practicum in teaching

Most of our students have served as assistants in undergraduate courses, and have been permitted to exercise a fair amount of independence in the laboratories. Further, the teaching aspect of seminar reports is stressed in some of our substantive graduate courses. It has never been the practice in our department, however, to employ students as even semi-independent instructors. In an effort to compensate for this lack, I arrange for several guest appearances of each seminar member. Most of these are in the introductory course, or in the fairly large intermediate course, and thus principally entail lecturing (McKeachie, 1969). The preferred plan is to give the student responsibility for a fairly well defined block of subject matter, and make available from two to six successive class periods. The extent of guidance is left to the student teacher and the responsible professor; my contribution to preparation is seldom more than very general. Unless the novice prefers otherwise, the rest of us observe from the rear of the classroom or through a one-way window. He usually finds it instructive, albeit somewhat traumatic, to review a tape of his performance. At our next session, we take time to hear his account of the experience, and we offer whatever suggestions seem appropriate. Some students seek a private conference with me for a more searching critique.

When possible, a student undertakes two series of substitute lectures, one during the first half of the year and the second toward the end, after our group discussion of the teaching process. While more extended practice would be beneficial, the limitation in time is, to some extent, offset by the more thorough preparation and intensive evaluation possible with the briefer assignment.

As the student takes his place behind the podium, certain matters of classroom administration are brought forcibly to his attention. Although his transient status limits his practical response, it affords a fitting time to swap recipes on the handling of routine and unusual organizational problems.

Examining and grading

An inescapable chore in most institutions is the certification of student performance, and the teacher's job is almost always complicated by this requirement. The new instructor may be particularly troubled by the apparent incompatibility between his twin roles of guide and evaluator, and experience may blunt his sensitivity to the dilemma rather than resolve it. To this are added certain mechanical complexities; if simple psychometric principles are known to college instructors (Wood, 1961), they are largely ignored in the testing and grading process. Some practice in examination construction and consideration of sample cases may be added to our class's theoretical discussions.

Evaluation of teachers and teaching

There is a substantial body of research comparing the effectiveness of instructional techniques, and searching for critical variables in the teaching situation (McKeachie, 1964). Our study of these data is less likely to reveal compelling arguments for adopting a particular teaching format than to generate an urge to do some investigating of our own. One project frequently suggested is the development of an evaluation form especially adapted for our departmental needs. Its application seems to be helpful to our colleagues, and it certainly dispels any preconception that definitive research in this area is simple--or even that undergraduates can readily be persuaded to play the part of judicious customer. The results of the college-wide evaluation of courses and teachers, administered by the student

government, have particular impact (and sometimes generate considerable sympathy), since we are well acquainted with the objects of the scrutiny. We also consider evaluation programs at other institutions, such as the one that has evolved over a 45-year span at the University of Washington.

Student-faculty relations

What are the faculty member's responsibilities to the student outside the classroom, and to what extent can extracurricular contacts affect the formal learning process as well as the general morale on campus? We consider the place of professional counselors in the educational enterprise, and their possible modes of cooperation with the professor (Siegel, 1968). Unfortunately, a large proportion of us are in colleges that make only limited provision for help by specialists, and we must individually work out some compromise between responding to the needs of the student and recognizing the limits of our competence. The graduate teaching assistant, being simultaneously a dispenser and a consumer of counsel, is in a uniquely favorable position to contribute to our deliberations. It is often the discussion of this problem that leads to the almost inevitable gripe session of the class—the invaluable consequence of which is the stirring of our departmental staff into periodic self-analysis.

The marketplace

It is natural for the members of the seminar to have certain practical concerns (Caplow, 1961; Marshall, 1964). What jobs are available for next year? How are contacts best made and exploited? What aspects of a position should most concern the candidate? What sort of bargaining is feasible? How are decisions between competing offers reached (a question becoming less critical with the shift of the market)? How should final agreements be formalized? I try to guide their thinking beyond original appointment. What is expected of the new teacher? How does one carve out his individual niche in the academic world? How can one ensure his continuing professional growth and corresponding institutional advancement? Should one seek out or seek to avoid administrative responsibilities? What sorts of consulting opportunities outside the university are available, and how can they best be integrated with the rest of one's work? Obviously our talk spans a wide range—from vita to philosophy of life, from committee assignments to tuition grants for children, from faculty teas to research leaves, from library acquisitions to AAUP compensation scales. Before the year is over, the seminar becomes the informal clearinghouse for the latest market news and firsthand reports of job interviews and missed airline connections.

Personnel problems

Professors and administrators are people and, like other people, carry their personalities along with them to the office. As long as this is so, ability and performance will be imperfectly correlated, recognition and reward sometimes whimsical, and job satisfaction only partially a function of salary and teaching load. The case histories we recount range all the way to psychosis, and the solutions that are volunteered are about as varied as we are. While it is unfortunate that the students have to be left in a state of some uncertainty, at least they are alerted to the variety of exigencies with which they may be required to cope.

Information storage and retrieval

Journals, books, abstracts, proceedings, meetings—the life of the scholar is becoming increasingly complex on both input and output sides. We try to foresee new practices, including computer assistance. Meanwhile, we find it useful to discuss the preparation of journal articles and the process of shepherding the manuscript through to the publication stage (as well as the cost of supplying reprints!). The quite different art of oral communication of scientific results merits still more attention, and the spring regional and state meetings add the emphasis of reality for most of the students.

Financial resources for higher education and research

If for no other reason than to know what requests can reasonably be made of the administration, a faculty member should have some knowledge of institutional bread-and-butter matters (Chambers, 1968). We document the general survey of financing by detailed examination of our own university's capital and operating budgets. To one who would anticipate the future, for example in terms of government control of education or the ultimate fate of the private university, an evaluation and projection of current fiscal trends is in order. As "the crunch" becomes more threatening, there is increasing incentive to explore the possibilities for support of personal research, and the students respond with alacrity to my suggestion that each prepare for criticism a grant proposal in the form required by some federal or foundation funding agency.

Social control: ethics, accreditation, legislation

With the proliferation of applied specialties since World War II, psychology has undergone a virtual revolution in terms of formal controls over both practice and training. The Code of Ethics of the American Psychological Association (*Casebook*, 1967; Golann, 1970) includes a number of items of special relevance to the teacher-scientist. Since individual conscience is supplemented by group consensus in the enforcement process, exchange of points of view within the class is particularly valuable. Some attention is given to the recurrent suggestions for development of general standards of professional conduct for scientists, for example through the American Association for the Advancement of Science, as well as to the possibility of achieving a code for college teachers through the AAUP committee on ethics. We follow the arguments for and against APA's approval of graduate specialty programs and of internships, and note the function of the American Board of Professional Psychology in conferring diplomate status on certain classes of professionals.

For the purpose of illustration, the 25-year history of legislative control in Virginia is reviewed from the conception of the first certification bill to the practices of the present licensing board, including its involvement in the nationwide reciprocity efforts. To heighten our concern, there are usually Congressional hearings on invasion of privacy, use of psychological tests, limitations on research involving human subjects, conditions of animal care and experimentation, as well as on the use

of fiscal power to limit the vigor of campus dissent. Problems of control have been particularly delicate in psychology, because of the nature of its basic subject matter and because of the discrepant orientations of researcher and practitioner. We suspect, however, that our colleagues in other fields will increasingly be confronted with similar issues, and that the study of our recent history could contribute to the wisdom of their decisions.

Does the seminar work? The reactions of the students, and particularly their testimony in later years, point to an affirmative answer. They have approached the postdoctoral phase of their careers with increased confidence, they have entered into their teaching duties with zest and seemingly with more than modest success, and they have promptly become effective participants in institutional affairs. Perhaps more important, many of them have maintained their active concern for the broad spectrum of higher education, have continued their reading and practical experimentation, and have helped bring to a number of campuses a broadened conception of the profession. It is not surprising that their considerable awareness and relative sophistication with regard to academic matters has tended from their first appointment to thrust them into positions of professional leadership, formal and informal. I should interject that this has apparently not hampered their growth as scientists, for their publication record attests to continuing research activity.

The value of the seminar is not limited to its effects upon the students. The reading and debating that is good for them helps maintain the elasticity of my professorial arteries, and their younger view helps me see the academic world through less presbyopic eyes. There is evidence from time to time that other students and staff members are drawn into the informal discussions that spill over between meetings, so that the impact upon the attitudes and practices within the department is fairly general. It is gratifying that reports of what we are doing have influenced other departments to move in a similar direction, and it may even be that our activities have from time to time impinged, at least subliminally, upon the thought processes of our administrators, to our mutual benefit.

I cannot pretend that this type of course would be accepted warmly into every graduate department. We are fortunate that our students are well provided, by our staff, with the teacher-scientist model. Undergraduate instruction is considered neither demeaning nor remote from the laboratory, and involvement in institutional affairs is the mode. In a less congenial setting, "Professional Problems" might be more of a bore than a pleasure to the instructor, and simply an unwelcome intrusion into the graduate student's already crowded schedule.

Under attack as never before, the university cannot survive unaltered. It should be no surprise to today's professor if his influence in the councils of change is minimal, for his training has made him a subject specialist; he is, in no real sense, a professional in higher education. It may not be too late for faculty members themselves to undertake their own remedial, do-it-yourself continuing education program. Perhaps our brightest hope, however, is to provide a more balanced background for the professor of tomorrow.

REFERENCES

Brown, J. W., and Thornton, J. L., eds. *New Media in Higher Education.* Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1963.

Buxton, C. E. *College Teaching: A Psychologist's View.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956.

Byse, C., and Joughin, L. *Tenure in American Higher Education.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1959.

Caplow, T., and McGee, R. J. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Science Editions, 1961.

Casebook on Ethical Standards of Psychologists. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1967.

Chambers, M. M. *Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Gains?* Danville, Ill.: Interstate, 1968.

Costin, F. "A Graduate Course in the Teaching of Psychology: Description and Evaluation." *Journal of Teacher Education* 19, Fall 1968, pp. 425-32.

Demerath, N. J., Stephens, R. W., and Taylor, R. R. *Power, Presidents, and Professors.* New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Dressel, P. L. *College and University Curriculum.* Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968.

Dunkel, H. B. "Training College Teachers." *Journal of Higher Education* 29, January 1958, pp. 1-7, 57-58.

Eurich, A. C., ed. *Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Golann, S. E. "Code and Conduct: On the Ethics Program." *American Psychologist* 25, February 1970, pp. 206-08.

Koen, F. The Training of Graduate Student Teaching Assistants." *Educational Record* 49, Spring 1968, pp. 92-102.

Lee, C. B. T. *Improving College Teaching.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.

Marshall, H. D. *The Mobility of College Faculties.* New York: Pageant Press, 1964.

McKeachie, W. J. *Teaching Tips.* New York: D. C. Heath, 1969.

_____, Isaacson, W., and Milholland, J. E. *Research on the Characteristics of Effective College Teaching.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964.

_____, and Milholland, J. E., eds. *Undergraduate Curricula in Psychology.* Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1961.

Metzger, W. P., Kalish, S. H., DeBardeleben, A., and Bloustein, E. J. *Dimensions of Academic Freedom.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Nowlis, V., Clark, K. E., and Rock, M. *The Graduate Student as Teacher.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Schwab, J. J. *College Curriculum and Student Protest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Schwartz, E. *Joint Statement on the Academic Freedom of Students. A Summary and Analysis.* Washington: U.S. National Student Association, 1967. ED 034 498. MF–$0.50, HC–$3.50.

Siegel, M., ed. *The Counseling of College Students.* New York: Free Press, 1968.

Singletary, O. A., ed. *American Universities and Colleges.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Skinner, B. F. *The Technology of Teaching.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Veysey, L. R. *The Emergence of the American University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Walker, E. L., and McKeachie, W. J. *Some Thoughts about Teaching the Beginning Course in Psychology.* Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1967.

Webb, W. B., ed. *The Profession of Psychology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962.

Williams, A. R. *General Education in Higher Education.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Wilson, L., ed. *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Wood, D. A. *Test Construction: Development and Interpretation of Achievement Tests.* Columbus, O.: Merrill, 1961.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Some of the following works suggested for supplementary reading on higher education are available in microfiche (MF) or hard/photo copy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Payment must accompany orders of less than $5.00. Abstracts of the documents appear in *Research in Education*, which is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Single copies cost $1.75; annual subscriptions, $21.00.

Astin, Alexander W. *The College Environment.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Alexrod, Joseph, and Associates. *Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Barnes, Curtis, and Splete, Allen, eds. *The University and Social Responsibility. Interim Report.* Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1969. ED 027 467. MF-$0.25, HC-$2.75.

Baskin, Samuel, ed. *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Bebout, John E. *Teaching and Research. Their Influence on Social Change.* Brookline, Mass.: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967. ED 011 366. MF–$0.25, HC-$1.45.

Blum, Richard H., and Associates. *Society and Drugs: Drugs I–Social and Cultural Observations. Students and Drugs: Drugs II–College and High School Observations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Campbell, Alan. *Politics of University Involvement in Social Change.* Brookline, Mass.: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967. ED 011 365. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.00.

Christiansen, Dorothy, *Urban Universities and the Community: A Bibliography.* New York: Center for Urban Education, 1968.

The College Campus in 1969: The Faculty. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969. ED 032 841. MF-$0.25, HC-$0.55.

Dibden, A. *The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities.* Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.

Dodds, Harold W. *The Academic President–Educator or Caretaker?* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Edling, Jack V. *Individualized Instruction: A Manual for Administrators.* Corvallis, Ore.: Oregon State University, Department of Continuing Education, 1970.

Education at Berkeley. Report of the Select Committee on Education. "The Muscatine Report." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Estrin, H. A., and Goode, D. M., eds. *College and University Teaching.* Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown, 1964.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Newcomb, Theodore, M. *The Impact of College on Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Foote, Caleb; Mayer, Henry, and Associates. *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Frankel, C. *Education and the Barricades.* New York: Norton, 1968.

Freedman, M. B., *The College Experience.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967.

Greenough, W. C. and King, F. P. *Benefit Plans in American Colleges.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Harcleroad, Fred F., ed. *Issues of the Seventies: The Future of Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

Hartnett, Rodney T. *The New College Trustee: Some Predictions for the 1970's.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Hefferlin, JB Lon. *Dynamics of Academic Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Hester, James M. *The University and the Disadvantaged: A Report From the President of New York University.* New York: New York University, 1968.

Higher Education: General Bibliography No. 1. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1968. ED 028 309. MF-$0.50, HC-$3.95.

Higher Education: General Bibliography No. 2. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1969. ED 032 439. MF-$0.50, HC-$5.40.

Improving College and University Teaching 17, Autumn 1969. (Entire issue on "Professor and Profession.")

Ingraham, M.H. *The Mirror of Brass: Compensation and Working Conditions of College Administrators.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

_____. *The Outer Fringes: Faculty Benefits.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Joughin, Louis, ed. *Academic Freedom and Tenure. A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Katz, Joseph, and Associates. *No Time for Youth. Growth and Constraint in College Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Klotsche, J. Martin. *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Leigh, Terry. *A Selected and Annotated Bibliography on Evaluating Performance of College Faculty Members.* Lexington: University of Kentucky, Program on Educational Change, 1969.

Mayhew, Lewis B. *Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum.* SREB Research Monograph No. 14. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969.

_____ *The Literature of Higher Education, 1969.* Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1970.

Morris, William H., ed. *Effective College Teaching.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1970.

Perkins, James A. *The University in Transition.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Porter, Lawrence C. *Climates of Learning and the Innovative Process, Workshop Conferences to Foster Innovation in Higher Education.* Yellow Springs, Ohio: Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, 1967. ED 014 306. MF-$0.50, HC-$3.05.

Preliminary Report of the Committee on the University and the City. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1968. ED 027 827. MF-$0.50, HC-$5.40.

The Quest for Relevance: Effective College Teaching. Volume III-The Social Sciences. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, March 1969. ED 027 857. MF–$0.50, HC-$3.65.

The Quest for Relevance: Effective College Teaching. Volume IV-Practical Concerns for All College Teachers. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, March 1969. ED 027 858. MF-$0.50, HC-$4.70.

Rauh, Morton A. *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Reisman, D., and Jencks, C. *The Academic Revolution.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Robinson, Lora, and Shoenfeld, Janet. *Student Participation in Academic Governance.* Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970. ED 035 786. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.50.

Runkel, Philip D. *The Campus as a Social-Psychological Laboratory.* Washington: American Psychological Association, 1968. ED 024 972. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.65.

_____, Harrison, Roger, and Runkel, Margaret, eds. *The Changing College Classroom. Innovations in Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

Sanford, Nevitt. *Where Colleges Fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. *Agony and Promise: Current Issues in Higher Education 1969.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.

_____. *Stress and Campus Response: Current Issues in Higher Education 1968.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Walters, E. *Graduate Education Today.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Woodring, Paul. *The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Zimmerman, Robert R. *Internal, External, and Central Incentives of College Teaching.* Missoula, Montana: Montana University, 1968. ED 030 367. MF-$0.25, HC-$1.10.